

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 30, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we take Thy name upon our lips and bow reverently before Thee that we may gain Thy favor and be kept this day in the embrace of Thy loving care. As Thou hast sent us into the world to make the world safe for freemen to live in, as Thou hast called us to give the supremacy to right over might, we pray that this day we may be enabled to subject the physical to the spiritual and raise the standard of righteousness both in our lives and in the life of the Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, April 24, 1918, when, on request of Mr. JONES of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	New	Smith, S. C.
Baird	Henderson	Norris	Smoot
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Nugent	Sterling
Calder	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Sutherland
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Swanson
Culberson	Kellogg	Phelan	Thomas
Cummings	King	Pittman	Thompson
Curtis	Kirby	Polindexter	Tillman
Fall	Knox	Pomerene	Trammell
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed	Underwood
France	McCumber	Shafroth	Vardaman
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh
Gallinger	McLean	Sherman	Watson
Gronna	McNary	Simmons	Williams
Gulon	Martin	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Hale	Nelson	Smith, Md.	

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. Goff] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained on official business.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained, taking part in the third liberty loan campaign. I wish also to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

## THE YANKTON SIOUX V. THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1070).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified copy of the findings of fact, with an opinion of the court, per curiam, of December 3, 1917, in the case of the Yankton Sioux Indians against The United States, No. 31253, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have a memorial from the mayor and city council of the city of Tacoma, Wash., calling attention to the fact that the United States is urging a minimum use of wheat, and to the further fact that by reason of this and the use of substitutes prices have been very greatly increased for the substitutes. They ask that some branch of the Government be vested with authority to take care of this situation. The memorialists close their memorial as follows:

The spirit of the people at large is loyal to the point of any needed sacrifice, but food is essential to life. In this as in all things affecting the life of the Nation the common people ask only the application of the recognized American principle: A square deal.

I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. I present a memorial of the Woman's Foreign and Home Missionary Societies of the Methodist Church of Vermilion, S. Dak., protesting against the use of grain and sugar in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD without the names.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## VERMILION, S. DAK., April 3, 1918.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

We, the members of the Woman's Foreign and Home Missionary Societies of the Methodist Church of Vermilion, S. Dak., do solemnly protest against the enormous waste of grain and sugar used in the manufacture of malt liquors in the United States, and we respectfully ask that this waste be stopped.

We are proud of our State in the stand she has taken, and we wish to help our sister States and the Nation in nation-wide prohibition and to help feed its defenders and save our country and our people to their liberty. The housewives are gladly cooperating with the Food Administration to feed our soldiers and our allies, and in their interests and the interests of the home and the people of the United States we respectfully ask that the manufacture and sale of malt and spirituous liquors be discontinued.

Mr. WARREN presented resolutions adopted by Monticello Grange, No. 6, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pinebluff, Wyo., favoring the fixing of prices on commodities and utensils used in the agricultural industry, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have been requested to present to the Senate the following resolution, which was passed unanimously by the executive council of the National American Woman Suffrage Association at a special meeting held in Indianapolis April 17, 1918. The executive council consists of the presidents of the State auxiliaries of the national association in the 48 States, and the resolution reads as follows:

Whereas America is fighting for the right of self-government for the people of Europe while one-half the people of America are denied that right; and

Whereas the ideal of democracy can be defended with increased zeal abroad if it be given practical application at home; and

Whereas the votes of the loyal women of America are needed as never before to sustain American ideals at the polls while our men fight for American ideals in the trenches; and

Whereas, country by country, all Europe is recognizing woman suffrage as a war measure fundamental to democracy, British women, Danish women, Icelandic women, Russian women, all having been enfranchised since the war began: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we women, in executive council assembled, call on the Senate of the United States to pass the Federal suffrage amendment, to the end that America may be strengthened in the fight for democracy abroad by the added strength of her democracy at home; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Member of the Senate and to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, this resolution, it seems to me, emphasizes the inconsistency of our position in fighting for democracy and at the same time denying to one-half the people of the United States the right to participate in government.

If the Declaration of Independence is true when it says that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed, it seems to me we can not consistently contend for the establishment of democracy in other nations as long as we deny it in our own.

The verity of this fundamental principle of democracy was thought to be so clear and conclusive that in the same instrument it was declared to be a self-evident truth—that is, one that is not the subject of question or dispute. How, then, can we justly deny to our own mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters the right to pass upon the laws that shall govern all?

Mr. President, the resolution further shows that this is a world question. It is not one confined to a State or to the United States. It shows that it is agitating the people of all nations; that it is an evolution in government; that it is proceeding with certainty in its determination in favor of the rights of humanity. Let us end this inconsistency and enthuse all of our people by adopting the joint resolution for a constitutional amendment granting equal suffrage to all of the governed of our States and Nation.

## PUNISHMENT OF SEDITION ACTS AND UTTERANCES.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, for some time I have thought of introducing a few letters out of the number which I have received upon a subject of very great importance to the country. I take this occasion to introduce them, as to-morrow the Senate will have before it the so-called sedition bill, and I think these communications bear somewhat directly upon that subject. I submit the communications and ask that they be read.

Mr. OVERMAN. I can not understand just what is to go into the RECORD.

Mr. FRANCE. If the Senator will give me a few minutes, I will explain the nature of the communications.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator wants to have some letters read?

Mr. FRANCE. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. As a part of his remarks.

Mr. OVERMAN. All right. I could not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. FRANCE. I ask that they be read, and I wish to say just a few words in connection with their presentation.

Mr. President, I confess that I have been profoundly disturbed by the course of our recent debates upon the sedition bill. Had I not come to know something of the minds and, I trust, something of the hearts of certain of my colleagues here whose words have so distressed me, I should have been forced to come to the conclusion that they had lost faith in the Republic and in the loyalty of her people.

There are spies here. In every warring country there must be spies. Mercenary spies are the foul and filthy vultures and harpies of war. But if such spies there be who attend or read the debates of this Senate, I say to them count not words spoken here in overzeal against those foolish ones who in this hour speak with contempt or ridicule when we mistake in putting on our unaccustomed armor. Go tell your Kaiser to look beyond the western line where stand the serried ranks of the heroic French and British hosts, and far beyond the point where from his high vantage ground he first saw the flag of this Republic flying gallantly and defiantly amid the storm and roar of his artillery, and far beyond the sea to the western horizon of the world, and bid him there behold what is written upon the western skies; for with the hand of this Republic it is written that his kingdom has been numbered and that here is an end to his autocracy, for through America and through a new and more comprehensive and cooperative democracy the people of the world are at last coming to their own. Go tell your Kaiser that it is a powerful hand when it shall be fully clenched and mailed, that the arm is unwithered, and that the mighty loins of the Republic girding now for battle—a Republic of a hundred million freemen whose blood is uncorrupted by sedition and untainted by treason—possess a power unbending and invincible, even though she may be somewhat awkward in this first putting on of her habiliments of war. She will be an adversary against whom his legions will dash and break in vain, for the young Republic has a great, loyal, lion heart, soon to be incased, full armored in gold and steel, and even yet upon these and, more than all, thrice armed in the eternal justice of her cause.

Mr. President, while we were for days debating a treason and sedition bill to place a gag and a rough hand upon the lips of the American people, I have been hearing from all parts of our country, to use your own most apt expression, men "Crying out to the Republic, 'What wilt thou have me to do?'"

I know that in my national organization or man-power bill I had proposed what seemed a drastic measure. It is quite natural that it should seem to be radical to attempt to transform a great free Republic for the time being into a "Nation in arms," and yet when my plan was given some publicity, particularly by the New York Times, I received from every section of our great country, and from those in different stations of life unknown before to me, words of encouragement and approbation. From New England they came, from the far South, from the Southwest and West, and even from Alaska, stretching away in her magnificent distances beyond the Arctic Circle, almost forgotten, but with her heart warm and loyal beneath her winter snows.

Mr. President, is it not possible that our plans have fallen thus into confusion because we have not had faith strong enough in the everlasting righteousness of our cause, in the absolute indestructibility of free institutions, in the immutable and indomitable spirit of our people, in their loyalty and devotion, which would lead them in this hour to count nothing too great a sacrifice which must be done to save the Republic from all harm? I have faith in our country. I have faith in the justice of our cause. I have faith in the love and loyalty of the sons of this Republic, and I now ask permission to have read these sincere and patriotic communications to which I have referred, from people unknown to me before they wrote. The first is from Brooklyn, N. Y., from an old lady 78 years old, but one whose words demonstrate that she has not lost her interest in her country; the second is from New York City, from a man over 50, who objects to the maximum age of 45; the third is from a big business man in Alabama, president of a large wholesale concern; and the fourth is from a prominent young man in Arcadia, Fla.

The fifth is from Juneau, Alaska, from a young lady, who says, though far away from the centers of activity, she is still keenly alive to some of the big things confronting our Nation to-day. I withhold from the Record the names of certain of the writers and some more personal portions of the letters, but the originals may be consulted by any Senator who may desire to do so. In the case of the Alaska girl, her name with her truly patriotic and eloquent words, written with so clear a comprehension of the Nation's need, I desire to have incorporated in the Record.

With reference to the young lady from Alaska, I merely wish to say this word: On the 2d of April I presumed on the time of the Senate to plead for that national organization and integration which I believed to be absolutely necessary for the winning of this war. In my weak way I attempted to give something of the philosophy which I believe underlies such a great and comprehensive plan. I had given some consideration to what I then said, and it took me over an hour to express what I wished to

say; but I know that nothing I could have said or nothing which I could possibly now say can speak with a persuasiveness which can approach that of this little girl in Juneau, Alaska, who now pleads with you for that better national organization which I believe to be indispensable if we are to successfully continue in this war against that new and fearful creation of our modern civilization—"the Nation in arms."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., February 10, 1918.

Senator JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If I had a thousand votes, I would cast them all for passage of your grand bill of conscription as the only way to solve war's industrial problems.

'Tis so direct and wonderfully simple—the keynote to success for America. Can nothing be done to pass it? Who could fail to see what a sweeping power (which we need) to secure our dear country from a disgraceful breakdown.

True, we have the soldiers, all courageous fighters; but they must be fed.

Must red tape be resorted to, in order somebody may have a say of no account, as it often happens?

When I read your bill in the New York Times Magazine it was so striking. The whole plan was like a moving picture to success. Well, here is one without a vote—from an old lady 78 years old—but have not lost my interest in our dear country.

May your bill pass unanimously.

Respectfully,

NEW YORK, N. Y., February 10, 1918.

Hon. JOSEPH I. FRANCE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Have just read your article in the Times on the organization of the labor for the farm and factory to stand behind the "boys" on the other side.

From the very start there was nothing in this line but a disorganized crowd of men willing to work, yet no one to take the lead and do something in a practical common-sense way. The man who had been the most extensively advertised, by getting his name and picture in the paper more times than the other fellow, was considered just the man for the place; otherwise he could not get what is called in the language of the day a "look in." No matter whether Republican or Democrat, no one seemed to be able to look ahead 24 hours. They could not see a chance of a serious condition ever confronting them, and that is more responsible than anything else for the present seemingly chaotic condition of affairs. If you had a pull, you could get where your services could be of some good. With no pull you could go work as a laborer or at anything you could get. There is an endless chance to criticize, but this is the time to build and not destroy, and much criticism tends that latter way, though honest criticism from anyone should prove beneficial. The difficulty is that honest criticism not judiciously made may start a conflagration.

One thing I object to in your article is the 18 to 45 rule. Why? There are plenty of men over 45 more competent than many men under. When the country needs men who can and are willing to work, why toss a man in the scrap heap because he is 45. If the rule is to apply to war workers in the factory, why not apply it to the President of the United States, Members of the House of Representatives, Senate, Cabinet, etc.? I am over 50 years old, yet am just as competent to-day as I was at 35, with the additional advantage of experience.

Yours,

ALABAMA, February 14, 1918.

Senator JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have read in the New York Times an account of your bill which you have introduced in Congress entitled "Conscription for all men from 18 to 45 years," and I wish to express to you my sincere wish that this bill will be acted upon favorably in Congress, as it is certainly just to the Nation as a whole, and would very likely include myself, and I am only 40 years of age. But be that as it may, until the war is over every man's business is war, and if he can not serve in the trenches or in the Navy very likely he could serve in some other department that will help to prosecute this war to a successful and final closing.

My line of business has already been conscripted in service, and the \* \* \* as a whole, are doing as much as any other line of business men in sacrificing profits and working on small margins to help win the war, and every man, woman, and child in the South as a rule are trying to do their bit in every way possible.

With my very best wishes for the passage of your bill, I am,

Yours, very truly,

FLORIDA, February 12, 1918.

Hon. JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Noting an excerpt of your conscription bill in my New York Sunday Times.

This is the only letter I have ever written since the outbreak of the war, except a few, very few, personal letters to my delegation, although have handled all the war data. \* \* \* In my judgment the bill is the most important proposal of all endeavors by the Government. It is more in accord with what I have at all times been sure would prevail than any measure introduced in Congress. It is the only sure foundation and underpinning upon which a safe governmental fabric and superstructure can be built for a successful prosecution of the war and a safe return to civic life. This is merely to express an individual interest, which I, however, believe is shared by every true American patriot.

Give my regards and best wishes to my life-long friend, your com-patriot in Congress, Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER.

Sincerely,



Senator JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE,  
Annapolis, Md.

JUNEAU, ALASKA, March 7, 1918.

DEAR SIR: In the February 10 issue of the New York Times I read a short sketch of one of your conscription plans. I was quite pleased with the article and wrote it in a little poem, which I thought you might like to see, so I am sending you a copy. Kindly pardon all the errors of an Alaskan girl who, though far away from the centers of activity, is still keenly alive to some of the big things confronting our Nation to-day.

Yours, very truly,

BINGIE OLDS CARPENTER,  
Occidental Hotel, Juneau, Alaska.

#### IN UNITY IS STRENGTH.

While a great number of men in Congress are worrying about having the War Department changed  
A small number of men are thinking of the whole Nation being re-arranged.

These few are the men of brains who look ahead  
And would see that all our Army would be clothed, cared for, and fed.  
They would reorganize immediately as a war measure of the day  
And later develop the plan into a permanent national policy that would stay.

Whereby the United States might know in detail at all times  
Just what its resources were in man power for every vital industry in all lines.

The immediate war project in brief would be  
To enroll all men between 18 and 45 and thus they could see  
What every man could best be called to do  
When needed at home or afar to protect Red, White, and Blue.  
The future plans of this great unity stand  
Would enroll every man, woman, and child within the land  
And to keep records of each, their birth and death, and all between  
So as to know the Nation's power in full it would seem.  
Some of the Senators who are the leaders of this plan  
Think that to win the war we must be organized to a man.  
In upholding this drafting plan they say in part  
The following words which must come right from the heart:  
The best and most effective thing we have to-day  
Is our drafting law, that we all will say;

For when we draft men we get the fighting force we need  
And don't have the hazards of the voluntary creed.  
But as President Wilson and everyone will say  
What use is a war horse in a land without the hay?  
In other words, if our Army go to the front to fight  
Without an organized system how can they be fed right?  
The farmers and munition hands should all be drafted, too.  
There then would be a head to things and the flag could pilot through.  
The way things stack up now it seems we draft our men to fight  
And make them go to Europe just to clean the Germans right.  
If we do this, why don't we then draft all the factory dads  
That make the guns and food and things to keep the Army lads?  
The Army and the Navy, who are toiling in the strife,  
Can never win without the men behind who sustains life.  
For every soldier in the field it takes at home five men  
To supply all the food and guns and shells to them.  
Not only think of ourselves, but our allies need to eat,  
It will take a mighty organization to supply them fat and meat and wheat.

When the working power of the whole United States will be enrolled  
To a man.

Our President then being at the head can  
Have all the help in any special line

To do a job in record-breaking time.  
Classified power in these modern times is the only kind that counts,  
Whether in the little-town affairs or in the vast national amounts.  
The sooner we realize that the drafting and unity must not only take  
In those who go to the front to fight,  
But those in every walk of life, then only will things come out right.  
And how easy it will be to conquer all the plans of autocracy  
And with the strength of united, itemized, and detailed labor power  
Bring to all the world the light of justice and democracy.  
(Bingie Olds Carpenter.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, there are a number of very short bills on the calendar, to which I think there is no objection, providing for certain amendments to the national bank act, and which are urgently desired by the Comptroller of the Currency to be considered. I should be very much gratified if we might dispose of those bills at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think we ought to proceed with the regular order.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded. If there be no further petitions and memorials, reports of committees are in order.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 2496) for the refund of duties paid on materials destroyed by fire, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 413) thereon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2205) for the relief of Isaac J. Reese (Rept. No. 416); and

A bill (S. 3566) authorizing the President to appoint Second Lieut. Ansel G. Wineman as a provisional second lieutenant in the Regular Army (Rept. No. 415).

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10843) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than

the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 417) thereon.

#### NATIONAL GERMAN-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

Mr. KING. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 3529) to repeal the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National German-American Alliance," approved February 25, 1907, and I submit a report No. 414) thereon.

In this connection I desire to state that later, if I have the time, I shall submit my personal views in regard to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### ALLEY HOUSES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. From the Committee on the District of Columbia I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4410) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," approved September 25, 1914, and I submit a report (No. 418) thereon. As this is an urgent matter, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Utah that in 1914 Congress passed a law prohibiting the use of houses in certain alleys in the District of Columbia. That law requires that the use of those houses be discontinued on July 1, 1918. The houses which still remain in the alleys and are habitable to-day house between 8,000 and 9,000 people. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as well as the Committee on the District of Columbia, think it is important that the time should be extended for the use of those houses until a year after the war, on account of the acute housing conditions in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. If the bill is not going to lead to any debate I shall not object, but if it leads to debate I shall object to its immediate consideration. Can the Senator say whether or not there is likely to be any debate on the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I wish to say that it is important that the people who are occupying these houses should know whether they can remain in them, because unless this bill is passed they will have to vacate them on July 1, 1918. Your committee thought that it was very important that the matter should be acted upon at once.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the bill leads to any considerable debate I reserve the right to object, but if it does not I shall not object.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I merely wish to take a moment. I was very much interested in the enactment of the law which this bill proposes to suspend, and it would only be because of the urgent necessities of the Government itself that I would consent to any suspension at all of that law. I agreed to this report in the committee; but I wish to state for the benefit of the record that I did so simply because of the necessities of the Government and because of the necessity of those people who are now occupying alley houses having some place in which to live. I did not do it out of any sympathy whatever for the owners of the property; I have no sympathy for them at all. They have taken no steps whatever since the law was passed to meet its terms. When it was passed they declared that it was unconstitutional and that they were going to fight it to the end; but they have apparently abandoned that plan of action. So I have no sympathy for them at all, and I want them to understand that when the time limit fixed by this suspending bill expires they must be prepared to obey the law as it is now written or suffer the consequences. The conditions that are a disgrace to our Capital must be abolished just as soon as it is possible to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Washington that I think the entire committee is in sympathy with his views in regard to this matter. There is no disposition to stop the removal of these houses, but simply to delay it in order that the housing accommodations of the city may be improved. There are 90,000 more people here than there were before the war, and it is hard to get houses. My idea in regard to the present consideration of this bill was that the people living in those houses ought to know what they have to depend upon. So far as I am concerned, I am in entire sympathy with the Senator from Washington. I think the houses ought to be done away with, but I think the time limit should be extended.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not intend to suggest that the chairman of the committee took any different attitude. I am satisfied that he is in hearty accord with my position in the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Absolutely.

Mr. OWEN. Let the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the operation of the second paragraph of section 1 (relating to the use or occupation of alley buildings as dwellings) of the act of Congress approved September 25, 1914, entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," be, and the same hereby is, postponed until the expiration of one year following the date of the proclamation by the President of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace between the United States and the Imperial German Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### COLLECTION OF GARBAGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I also report from the Committee on the District of Columbia the bill (H. R. 10613) to provide for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse of the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 419) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, I will say in regard to this bill that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia thought they had a contract for the collection and disposal of the garbage and refuse in the District of Columbia, and there was a forfeit of \$3,000 put up; but the contractors refused to sign the contract and forfeited the \$3,000. As matters now stand there is no way in which to get rid of the refuse. This is a House bill, which has been passed by the House, and it gives to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a means of providing for the disposition of the refuse and the garbage.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator what expense to the Government is involved in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It gives the commissioners the privilege of condemning certain properties in order that they may carry on the business. They now have no means whatever of disposing of the refuse and the garbage. They had a contract, as they thought; there was a forfeit of \$3,000 put up; but when the time came to sign the contract the contractors refused to sign it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has not answered my question, and I shall have to put it in another way. Has the Senator any idea as to how much money will be involved in the passage of this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I suggest that the bill be read, so that the Senator can see. There is quite an amount involved, I think some \$600,000; but that will be reduced to about \$200,000 by the revenue from the disposal of the by-products.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object until I see whether or not it precipitates a discussion. If it does and there is any delay, I must make an objection.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that the passage of this bill is very important if we want the refuse and the garbage taken care of in the District of Columbia. The commissioners have no means whatever of taking care of it after the expiration of the present contract, which will expire on June 30 of this year.

Mr. SWANSON. I reserve the right to object when I see how much time it will take.

Mr. OWEN. Let the bill be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Virginia will not get impatient. This is a matter of supreme importance to the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is a very important matter to the health of the people of Washington.

Mr. GALLINGER. The present contract expires on the 30th of June. No one has been willing to enter into a new contract, and the District of Columbia has to take care of this garbage if the health of the people is to be conserved. I hope, even if it does take a few minutes, that the bill will be considered at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the commissioners have made three advertisements for bids. They got one, but the company submitting it has refused to sign the contract, and forfeited the \$3,000 that was put up; and nobody can be gotten to take the contract.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Utah that the bill provides for an appropriation of \$620,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that that is the initial proposition; but a great deal of it comes back from the sale of by-products—the greases, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask that the bill be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I reserve the right to object. I have not the slightest idea what the bill proposes, and I can not tell unless I either read it myself or hear it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 4460) for the relief of Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., and of the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4461) granting a pension to Abbie B. Garrett (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 4462) granting a pension to Etta Warner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 4463) granting an increase of pension to Henry Divilbiss (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4464) for the survey and construction of a system of military highways on the Pacific coast (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce a bill because I am obliged to leave the Chamber. It is a bill authorizing the President to increase the Military Establishment by an additional 3,000,000 men. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I think by next Friday I shall be prepared to submit some remarks to the Senate in support of its passage.

The bill (S. 4459) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after paragraph 4, section 1, the following: "The President is further authorized, in his discretion and at such time as he may determine, to raise and begin the training of an additional force of 3,000,000 men, organized, officered, and equipped, as provided in the third paragraph of this section, such men to be called for training at such time and in such numbers as the President may direct."

SEC. 2. *Be it further enacted,* That section 2 of the aforesaid act be amended by striking out the sentence "Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens, or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of 21 and 30 years, both inclusive, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens and who at the time of such draft shall be between the ages of 21 and 30 years, both inclusive, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with this act."

#### INCREASE OF NATIONAL ARMY.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill directing the Secretary of War to call an additional 1,500,000 men from the registry of the selective-draft act and to proceed forthwith to train and equip them for service in the National Army.

In introducing it I should like to say that I notice in the press the Secretary of War is considering this matter and that conferences are being held about it, and I presume that Congress is waiting until somebody in the War Department prepares a bill and has it introduced. My opinion is that Congress ought to act immediately and that there ought not to be any delay in



increasing the Army. Instead of holding conferences we ought to act. The foundation for this increase is already laid in laws that have already been enacted. All that is necessary is to call an additional number of men, and the brief bill which I am now introducing authorizes contracts and the incurrence of expenses that may be necessary in carrying out this work. There ought not to be a day, there ought not to be an hour, lost. Destiny and opportunity are marching by while we are holding conferences. One year, at least, is required to train men for battle, and immediate steps ought to be taken to provide them. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 4465) to increase the National Army was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, to which I trust there may be no objection, and I shall ask immediate consideration for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 233), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Printing is hereby directed to inquire into the reasons for the irregular delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to addressees outside of the District of Columbia; and also as to what improvements may be adopted that will make more legible the mailing addresses placed on the wrappers.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, some weeks ago the distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD outside of the District of Columbia was suspended. I called attention to that fact, and an explanation was given that there was not a sufficient supply of print paper to print it. Shortly after the supply of paper appeared to be adequate and the RECORD was again sent to those who are designated by Senators and Members of the other House and they were received to some extent at least. Complaints are now coming to me that the RECORD is being received so irregularly that it is of very little consequence to those who want to read the RECORD and keep up with the proceedings of Congress, and there are many such people in the country, some in my own State.

Two letters came to me yesterday, and I will read just a paragraph from each. One letter says:

Yesterday morning the RECORD of April 10 reached me—

This was written April 25—

It stirred my blood some to think that somebody held up my mail as long as he pleased. The RECORDS come usually two at a time in fair condition, but now everything is mixed. This morning the RECORD for April 5 has arrived, but nearly all the numbers up to and including April 20 are here.

That letter is from a lady residing in Massachusetts, who reads the RECORD, a New Hampshire woman.

The next letter is from a gentleman living on a farm in New Hampshire, an educated man, formerly a resident of the State of Texas, who has returned to his old home. He says:

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD now comes to me addressed in such better way as that the postal clerks can read the addressing, but to offset this improvement the dates come badly mixed so as to break up all consecutive numbering and dates; for example, those for the 5th and 10th of April were followed by those for the 18th and 19th. This method makes it as interesting as reading the dictionary, as I am not smart enough to keep up with the procession. If other recipients get theirs in the same way, it may well disgust those who try to read the RECORD. I suppose the Official Bulletin gets out promptly. It looks to me as though some sinister method lies against outside distribution of the RECORD.

Mr. President, there is a great need of improvement in the Postal Service at the present time. It not only applies to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but it equally applies to our individual mail. As an illustration, three copies of my home paper—those for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday last—reached me this morning all at the same time. A paper printed in Manchester, N. H., on last Thursday also came in this morning's mail. Our letters are to a very large extent being transmitted in the same irregular fashion.

I have no disposition to invite a controversy about this matter, but I understand that it largely results from the fact that the Postmaster General in his wisdom or unwisdom—unwisdom I think—has taken off the cars where the mail was formerly distributed, and that the mail is now distributed at the terminals. I noticed one day when I was in the Union Station a great pile of mail at one end of the concourse. A wagonload was there waiting to be distributed, and I have been told that it sometimes remains at certain terminal points four or five days before the mail is distributed.

It is something that ought to be corrected; but that does not enter into this matter that I have called attention to in my resolution. I simply want the Committee on Printing to call before it those who are handling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and inquire why it is that the RECORDS are not being sent out with some degree of regularity. I hope the resolution will pass and the grievance complained of be removed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is the resolution to be acted on now? Mr. FLETCHER. Let the resolution be read again. I did not hear it. I may say that as of the RECORD there were only printed for a while enough copies to supply the local demand, and it was held up as to outside distribution. That might account for the delay.

Mr. GALLINGER. I called attention to it, I will say to the Senator from Florida, and it was then corrected, and the RECORDS were then going out regularly, as I understand it, and they are reaching the people; but in some cases they are reaching them in 5, 10, or 15 days after the date of publication.

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not know but that the copies now supplied for outside distribution were printed at a very much later date.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Committee on Printing can readily make an inquiry.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask to have the resolution read.

The resolution was again read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### THE POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. GALLINGER. In this connection I ask to have printed without reading a portion of an article from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin of New York, under date of April 25, 1918. It relates to the Postal System in a broader sense, a matter that I feel very sure Congress will have to take cognizance of and look into in the near future.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### "INEFFICIENT POSTAL SERVICE.

"Is there any good reason why Congress should not take up the problem of postal reform before it adjourns? The service has steadily deteriorated for many years until at last it has become a monumental example of inefficiency, for which the war is no excuse. No more striking instance of Government failure in business has ever been presented, and for some unaccountable reason there is a singular indifference to public complaints.

"In first-class mails delays are excessive and constant. They began long before the disorganization attributed to the war and before introduction of the parcel post, though the latter much intensified the decline of the service. It is no uncommon experience for letters to be not merely hours but days behind a reasonable period for delivery. Local letters not infrequently require 24 hours for delivery in this city or near-by suburbs, and corresponding delays are a common occurrence in the mail transit between near-by cities. Such delays in first-class mail are a serious concern not alone in family and social affairs but especially in business matters which are particularly dependent upon prompt and regular mails. As this branch of the service is of supreme importance and particularly profitable under the advanced rates, the present low standard of efficiency should not be any longer tolerated. There should be no difficulty in improving this branch of the service, especially as letter rates have been raised from 1 and 2 cents to 2 and 3 cents.

"In the case of second-class mails the deterioration has been much greater than in the first class. Newspapers and periodicals are commonly days and not infrequently a week behind normal delivery. Publishers and subscribers are weary of complaints, which usually receive scant attention and fail to bring any relief. Many complaints are never made, because useless.

"The Post Office is the biggest business institution in the United States. There is no organization more closely interwoven in the life and industry of the country. As a means of communication it is far more vital to convenience and comfort than the telephone or the telegraph; and is only exceeded in importance by the railroads. Yet it is operated on a low and discreditable standard of efficiency. Both as a business organization and as a public service it must be classed as defective, and any of our big business institutions selected at random would smother it in shame by comparison. For this deplorable condition there is only one party to blame, and that is an overpatient public. As long as the public submits to bad service there will be no improvement. When public opinion demands better service with sufficient vigor, improvement will promptly come. At present there seems to be no way of awakening the responsible auto-crats and bureaucrats at Washington to a sense of their incapacity. Congress, with its passion for investigation, might with advantage turn on the limelight in this direction. Instead of spending time on Utopian plans for absorption of the telephone, telegraph, and express companies, or the development of motor-truck lines, aeroplane routes, or cutting out pneumatic tubes, etc., it would be far better to meet the primary objects of the service, which are to carry the first and second class mails with

promptness and regularity. What have the various commercial organizations to say about our present postal service? The Merchants' Association of this city has already made its protest. Others should follow."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire whether the article he has submitted has anything to do with the mail between this country and our boys at the front?

Mr. GALLINGER. It has not. I think it is the domestic mail that this article discusses. I understand there is a great deal of complaint being made at the nondelivery of mail to the soldiers.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I hoped that the article had something to do with that subject, and that an inquiry might be made to see how those mails could be facilitated.

#### INCREASE OF THE ARMY.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I submit a Senate resolution, which I ask to have read and go over under the rule to be called up.

The resolution (S. Res. 234) was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate hereby urges immediate action to provide means for the organization of an army of 5,000,000 men.

*Resolved further*, That the Committee on Military Affairs be requested to prepare a bill providing for the immediate training of officers and the manufacture of munitions for an army of 5,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule. The morning business is closed.

#### FIRST YEAR OF PRESENT WAR.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that after the close of the routine morning business on Friday I shall ask permission to submit some brief remarks in a review of the first year of American activity in the present war, its lessons, and suggestions for our future work.

#### SEDITIONARY ACTS AND UTTERANCES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice to Senators that to-morrow morning I expect to call up the conference report on what is known as the espionage bill.

#### AMENDMENT OF NATURALIZATION LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 220).

Mr. HARDWICK. I present a conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to naturalization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a request to consider the report now?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; the papers are in the possession of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will lie on the table and be printed.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 1, subdivision 7: Strike out in lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 the following: "and who may be honorably discharged therefrom after an enlistment of not less than four years, or who may receive an ordinary discharge with recommendation for reenlistment," and insert the following: "and who, after service of not less than three years, may be honorably discharged therefrom, or who may receive an ordinary discharge with recommendation for reenlistment."

Page 2, line 22: Strike out the word "at" and insert in lieu thereof the words "engaged in the present," so as to read: "Any alien serving in the military or naval service of the United States during the time this country is engaged in the present war."

Page 3, line 11: After the words "United States" insert the following: "and the place of such military service shall be construed as the place of residence required to be established."

Page 4, lines 4 and 5: Strike out the words "for the time required."

Page 4, line 7: Strike out the word "rebuttable."

Page 4, line 21: After the first "the" in the line insert the words "time of the."

Page 6: At the paragraph commencing "During time when the United States is at war," after the word "During," insert the word "the."

Page 7, subdivision 9: In the fifth line of the subdivision, after the word "naturalization," insert "as provided in this subdivision."

Page 8, subdivision 10: In line 3 of the subdivision strike out "May" and insert "July." In line 4 of the subdivision strike out "10" and insert "14."

Page 9, subdivision 11: In line 14 of the subdivision, after the word "hearing," insert "or heard"; strike out the word "due" and insert "90 days"; after the word "notice" insert the words "given by the clerk of the court."

On page 10, in the second proviso: After the words "Provided further" strike out "That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, from time to time, by proclamation or otherwise, to except natives, citizens, subjects, or denizens of any country with which the United States is or may be at war, or any individual or class thereof, from the classification of alien enemies, and thereupon they shall have the privilege to apply for naturalization." In lieu of this insert "That the President of the United States may, in his discretion, upon investigation and report by the Department of Justice fully establishing the loyalty of any alien enemy not included in the foregoing exemption, except such alien enemy from the classification of alien enemy, and thereupon he shall have the privilege of applying for naturalization."

Page 10, subdivision 12: Strike out the word "no" in the first line of the subdivision and insert the word "any."

Page 11, in line 2: Insert, after the words "United States is now at war," the word "who."

Page 11, line 5: After the word "service," insert the following: "may resume his citizenship by taking the oath of allegiance to the United States prescribed by the naturalization law and regulations, and such oath may be taken before any court of the United States or of any State authorized by law to naturalize aliens or before any consul of the United States, and certified copies thereof shall be sent by such court or consul to the Department of State and the Bureau of Naturalization."

Page 16, section 3, paragraph 3: Strike out "Hereafter, subject to the provisions of subdivision 11 of this act, no citizen or subject of any country which by law permits its citizens or subjects to detain their citizenship or allegiance in such country after being naturalized in another country shall be eligible for naturalization in the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title, and agree to the same.

THOMAS W. HARDWICK,

THOMAS P. GORE,

WILLIAM P. DILLINGHAM,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

JOHN L. BURNETT,

ADOLPH J. SARATH,

JOHN E. RAKER,

E. A. HAYES,

ALBERT JOHNSON,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

#### HOUSING OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10265, commonly known as the housing bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10265) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], which will be read:

The SECRETARY. On page 4, at the end of section 1, add the following additional proviso:

*Provided further*, That in communities where housing development is to be carried on under this act such communities, or persons desiring so to do, shall be permitted to furnish a certain per cent of the cost of providing said housing facilities under such a plan of development and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Labor and the persons interested in the plan of development, but in no instance shall a loan of more than 85 per cent of the cost of development be made to such communities or the persons interested in the development: *And provided further*, That the Government shall take a first lien for the amount of money so advanced by the Government.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. That amendment comes in after line 17 on page 4. Is it the status of the bill now that the Senate has considered all of page 4 except this amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. I think a mistake was made in the announcement by the Secretary. We have only considered page 2.



The amendment ought to come at the end of subsection (b). We have not considered page 3.

Mr. FALL. That was my understanding.

Mr. SWANSON. I think it was a mistake, and I will ask to have it corrected. I believe the amendment was intended to be added to subsection (b) of section 1.

Mr. FALL. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if it would not be possible—I think it would very greatly facilitate matters if it were possible—to consider now an amendment on page 1 of the bill. There will be such amendments offered later, and if the amendment were adopted it would possibly obviate the necessity existing in the minds of Senators to offer various other amendments and bring up the discussion of the general subject. I will say frankly that I offered the suggestion a few days since with reference to this bill which I shall offer at the proper time in the shape of an amendment, but if it is held that the first section on page 1 of the bill can not be amended until after we conclude the consideration of all the other amendments, other amendments will be offered which would not be offered provided that that amendment is adopted by the Senate on page 1.

The suggestion which I offer is that to be consistent with ourselves, not to stultify ourselves, we should strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" in the bill and insert in lieu thereof "President of the United States," vesting directly in the President the power to exercise the authority conferred by the bill. Certainly by the passage yesterday by this body of the Overman bill it becomes all the more apparent that it would be stultification to vest authority in the Secretary of Labor which yesterday we provided should be coordinated or exercised by the President of the United States.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will be very glad to withdraw the amendment for the present if the Senator wishes.

Mr. FALL. I wanted to know whether the Senator from Virginia, who has charge of the bill, would insist upon going along in regular order or whether he would be willing to consider now the amendment to section 1?

Mr. SWANSON. I think that would precipitate a long debate on minor matters. I know the amendment the Senator contemplates offering. I suggest that the question as to who shall administer this law be passed over and the bill be perfected, saving the right to offer the amendment later.

Mr. FALL. I will explain my position to the Senator very briefly, if he will allow me.

Mr. SWANSON. Then, we would see if a conclusion could be reached as to that proposition. I suggest that we continue to perfect the bill, and the rights of the Senator will be reserved. I will give him every opportunity, and if the Senator fails to have the administration fixed as he desires in the bill he will have an opportunity to offer his amendment after that is disposed of. It seems to me we would make headway to go on and perfect the bill and then dispose of section 1. There was a unanimous-consent agreement that the bill should be disposed of by sections. We were proceeding by sections, and I will ask to reconsider that section in committee of the whole.

Mr. LODGE. We are not proceeding by sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield further?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. Unanimous consent was given that the bill should be disposed of by sections.

Mr. LODGE. To dispose of the committee amendments first.

Mr. SWANSON. No; that was rejected, and then a unanimous-consent agreement was made that the bill should be considered by paragraphs.

Mr. LODGE. We have never disposed of paragraph (b) on page 3.

Mr. SWANSON. We have not reached that.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is away over on page 4.

Mr. SWANSON. That was a mistake. The Senator from Massachusetts was not here. That ought to be an amendment to paragraph (b). Unanimous consent was given that the bill should be disposed of by paragraphs.

Mr. LODGE. I supposed we were on paragraph (b).

Mr. SWANSON. We are on paragraph (b).

Mr. LODGE. That does not shut out anybody from offering amendments to any part of the bill.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator will yield a moment, I will explain exactly my position.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to know about the unanimous-consent agreement referred to.

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not understand that there had been any unanimous-consent agreement. My recollection is that I objected to the request that was made in the beginning of the consideration of the bill, and I said at that time I could see some reasons for the plan to be adopted with reference to appropriation bills, but I was opposed to it with reference to bills of this kind.

Mr. SWANSON. I asked unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered first.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; and I objected.

Mr. SWANSON. An objection was interposed, and then I asked unanimous consent, as I recollect, that the bill should be disposed of by paragraphs for amendments. I have no desire to insist on that request, but if a motion to reconsider should prevail I simply desire to dispose of it in the way that may be most speedily done and most satisfactorily to the Senate. My suggestion was that we should proceed with the bill and perfect it. Of course, the Senator from New Mexico has intimated to me that if the authority to administer it is not given, as he suggests, he would offer a certain amendment, and after that question is disposed of that amendment could be offered, but what I asked was to complete the bill instead of reverting back to section 1, paragraph 1. I leave it entirely to the pleasure of the Senate. That was simply a suggestion of mine.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that my amendment has been withdrawn for the present, so that the Senate can go on with other amendments to the bill.

Mr. FALL. I am perfectly willing always to state exactly my reasons for any suggestion that I may make. If we are to proceed as we are proceeding now, with the understanding that we can not offer an amendment now and have it considered and adopted or rejected to section 1, if that is the parliamentary situation, then I shall have an amendment to offer to subsection (c) on page 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the parliamentary situation, the Senator from New Mexico may offer his amendment now. Whether it shall be considered or not is a matter that is to be determined.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I will explain my position exactly. I propose to offer an amendment to this bill provided this authority is left as it is now in the bill, on page 3, after the word "money," in line 8, to insert:

*Provided further, That in managing, leasing, renting, exchanging, selling, or conveying such lands, houses, buildings, and equipment no preference shall be given one laborer or class of laborers over another.*

I shall follow that up by proposing amendments to other portions of the bill along a similar line if the power to exercise the authority conferred by the terms of this bill is vested in the President of the United States. I do not care to raise these questions or to offer these amendments providing that there shall be no differentiation in favor of or against union labor; otherwise I shall offer the amendments and discuss them at the proper time, giving my reasons for guarding the provisions of the bill by such amendments, as I understand those reasons to exist. If the power is vested in the President it is for him to exercise it, and I shall then have no desire to offer these later amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the amendment which the Senator intends to propose be sent to the desk.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On line 3, page 1, I move to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor, under the direction of the President of the United States," and to insert "President of the United States."

Mr. SWANSON. We have not yet finished the reading of the bill to that point. The Senator's amendment will be in order when the reading shall have reached that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now in order, as the Chair understands.

Mr. FALL. The amendment is on page 1, line 3.

Mr. SWANSON. That has been passed.

Mr. FALL. That is exactly the proposition about which I was asking, and the Chair has ruled that I might offer this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the parliamentary situation to be such that the amendment may be offered at this time.

Mr. FALL. Then I offer that amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to make a suggestion. There must be some final disposition of things. The language "the Secretary of Labor, under the direction of the President of the United States," has already been adopted by the Senate by a vote. That question was voted on and decided in the affirmative

by the Senate. I have told the Senator from New Mexico that I would move to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted, so that these questions could come up again, but that paragraph has been amended and disposed of.

Mr. GALLINGER. The paragraph was not fully disposed of for I myself have an amendment to offer to it, but the Senator from Virginia is right in saying that the amendment was agreed to. The vote whereby it was agreed to ought to be reconsidered, if the Senator from New Mexico is to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that this amendment proposes to strike out some other portion of the bill that was not agreed to.

Mr. FALL. It would be necessary to perfect the bill, of course, to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor," where they occur, for instance, on page 4. There the words "the Secretary of Labor" appear twice; that is, in subsection (e) and also in section 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Why does the Senator from Virginia think the amendment is not now in order, if he wishes to raise the question?

Mr. SWANSON. Because unanimous consent was given that the bill should be considered and disposed of by paragraphs as in Committee of the Whole. Subsection (a) has been read and amended, and subsection (b) is now under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has there been any unanimous-consent agreement about that?

Mr. SWANSON. There was a unanimous-consent agreement that the bill should be considered by paragraphs. I think that will be found in the Record.

Mr. FALL. That it should be considered by sections, I presume, not by paragraphs.

Mr. SWANSON. There is bound to be some disposition of a matter. The Senate can not adopt a section and then proceed to dispose of it again without reconsidering the vote by which it was first adopted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think there could have been such an agreement on a bill of this character. I never heard of such a thing in the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. I will look up the Record in regard to the matter.

Mr. LODGE. It would not be allowed to shut up the text of a bill. I am not speaking of committee amendments—but to shut up the text of a bill in water-tight compartments, and after they have been read that then the text of the bill could not be amended. The whole bill is open to amendment until it is passed to a third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is usually the case.

Mr. SWANSON. The whole bill is amendable after it gets into the Senate, but does the Chair hold that, after an amendment is adopted as in Committee of the Whole, then it can be further amended without a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, and there be no termination to a matter?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Virginia had listened to what I said, he would have known that I did not refer to the amendments of the committee, but that I referred to the text of the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. I asked unanimous consent; but objection was made, and the whole bill was read.

Mr. LODGE. Then the whole bill is open to amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. When that was completed, if the Senator will permit me, I asked unanimous consent that the committee amendments should be first considered. Unanimous consent was refused. I then asked unanimous consent that the bill should be considered by paragraphs, each paragraph to be open to amendment from the committee or from any Senator. That agreement, as I understand, was made, and we were proceeding with the consideration of the bill by paragraph and had reached paragraph (b).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not understand that there has been any unanimous-consent agreement to adopt this bill by sections and that when a section shall have been completed it can not be further amended. The Chair does not understand that there is any unanimous-consent agreement that there shall be such a procedure.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask the Secretary to look up the record of the first day's proceedings, when the bill came up for consideration, and see what the agreement was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] is in order.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. For the purpose of allowing the Senator from New Mexico to offer his amendment, which does take the place of an amendment which was agreed to—that is, the insertion of the words "under the direction of the President of the United States"—I ask the Senator from Virginia to ask unanimous consent that the vote by which that amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. SWANSON. I stated to the Senator from New Mexico that after we proceeded further with these paragraphs—and I do not see why any Senator should object—I would ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which that was agreed to, so that it could be further discussed.

Mr. FALL. I think I have the floor, Mr. President. I have endeavored to explain, and will again explain, for the benefit of the Senator from Virginia, that if we now proceed—although I, of course, understand that we shall have a later opportunity, with or without his consent, to amend this section, though I thank him for his consideration, yet I know that I would have a right to offer the amendment which I proposed—if we are going to proceed now, I shall offer other amendments, and I will say to the Senator from Virginia that, in my judgment, the amendments which will be offered will require so much more time for their consideration by the Senate that he will lose time instead of gaining time, unless he accepts the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire, if it is necessary to reconsider the words or the paragraph to which I have called attention.

Mr. SWANSON. If it will facilitate matters and save time I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which everything has been adopted may be reconsidered, and that we proceed by unanimous consent with a rereading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will relieve the situation. Is there objection? The Chair hearing no objection, it will be so arranged.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as a matter of record, there was no agreement of any kind in reference to this matter. I have before me the Record of the first day's proceedings, which discloses that there was no agreement of any kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood.

Mr. SWANSON. From what page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does the Senator from Massachusetts quote?

Mr. LODGE. From page 5193 of the Record of April 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The section of the bill is open to amendment, and the Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, when this bill was up for consideration I made the suggestion prior to the passage of the Overman bill that, to be consistent, the words "Secretary of Labor" should be stricken from this bill and the words "President of the United States" should be inserted. As I have just stated, I can not conceive now, since the passage of the Overman bill, how there could be any possible objection to the amendment which I have offered. I sincerely hope it will be adopted. It will relieve my mind, I will say, to a very great extent of the objections which I have, and which I shall urge most strenuously, to other provisions of the bill.

I am frank to say that I think the bill is a very poorly considered bill. I am distinctly in favor of voting all the money necessary for housing purposes in cooperation with necessary war work, but there has not yet been in this or in any other Congress a measure of such importance as affecting the entire future of this country, in my judgment, as this measure now up for consideration may become.

It is adopting an entirely new rule, Mr. President; and in the event the amendment which I have offered is rejected, I shall undertake to explain at length my reasons for offering it and the objections which I have to other provisions of the bill vesting this absolute authority in the Secretary of Labor.

I am aware of the fact that some of my colleagues are willing to amend this bill by providing that the authority shall be vested in the Secretary of Labor, in the Secretary of the Navy, and in the Secretary of War, but that would not remove my objections at all. The authority, if it is to be vested in anyone, should be vested in the President of the United States. If the President of the United States then chooses to delegate that authority to the Secretary of the Navy, to the Secretary of War, and to the Secretary of Labor, or to any one of the three or to anyone else whomsoever, his then is the responsibility. After the Senate voted as it did yesterday, certainly I will under no circumstances by my vote assist in the passage of an act—a subsequent piece of legislation—undertaking to drive a wedge into the legislation which we adopted on yesterday.

I have other and very strong reasons for my objection to the bill as it stands now, just as serious even in the event that the amendment which I understand will be offered, possibly in the nature of a substitute for my amendment, shall be adopted.



Mr. President, I do hope that the amendment vesting this power in the President of the United States will be adopted.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like, for the information of the Chair and of the Senate, in regard to the understanding as to the procedure during the consideration of this bill, to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5204, as follows:

Mr. SWANSON. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be proceeded with by paragraphs, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed with the bill by paragraphs. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. And that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not willing to consent that committee amendments shall be first considered. I can see reason for such a request in the case of an appropriation bill, but I think there are many reasons why we should not follow that practice in the case of a bill of this character.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well; I will modify the request and merely ask that the consideration of the bill be proceeded with by paragraphs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have reached another agreement, and I suggest that we proceed under that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Have I the floor, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and I are agreed on one point, and that is that the powers conferred by this bill should not be conferred upon the Secretary of Labor. However, we differ in regard to conferring those powers on the President. I believe that the various departments having contracts and in Government plants control of the industries, for the employees of which it is proposed to provide housing facilities, should administer this bill, namely, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, and therefore I offer as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico an amendment conferring these powers upon the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy; or, if my amendment is not the first amendment offered, I offer my amendment as a substitute to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico and should like to speak to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the bill is to be considered by sections. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, however, is not in order just now, because the words proposed to be stricken out are not yet in the bill; those words constitute an amendment reported by the committee, but have not yet been adopted.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I ask the Chair to state why my amendment is out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey proposes to strike out words which have not yet been incorporated in the bill. The Secretary will read the words proposed to be stricken out.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 3, after the words "Secretary of Labor," the committee proposes to insert the words "under the direction of the President of the United States"; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN proposes to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor, under the direction of the President of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The words "under the direction of the President of the United States" are not yet incorporated in the bill. Those words merely constitute a suggested amendment.

Mr. LODGE. If the Chair will permit me, the Senator from New Jersey can surely move to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. And to insert the "Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, there is an amendment pending now to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and insert the words "President of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from New Jersey can move his amendment as a substitute for that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. We have reconsidered the whole matter, and we are now commencing anew with the bill as though nothing had been done heretofore. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor and has offered the first amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and insert—

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. I understood that I had an amendment pending and that the Senator from New Jersey was offering his amendment as a substitute for my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was the Chair's understanding at first; but we have reconsidered the whole matter and we have commenced on the bill anew. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized, and his amendment is pending.

Mr. FALL. I bow to the decision of the Chair.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand the Senator—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. SWANSON. Has the Senator from New Jersey the floor?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have the floor; yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not so understand; the Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment to the bill because I do not believe that the powers conferred in this bill are conferred on the proper department. It creates a new building organization in the Department of Labor that is entirely unnecessary and impracticable. I am a member of the committee, and I was opposed to vesting these powers in the Department of Labor, and several other members of the committee agreed with me; but realizing and recognizing the emergency that existed in the lack of housing facilities for employees at various war plants, we agreed to report the bill, leaving the title as it was when introduced, but reserving the right to amend the bill on the floor and to oppose the bill if these powers were not transferred to the department which we believed was the proper department.

There is no good reason to create a new building department; it is contrary to the policy at the present time of the Senate, that the departments shall be coordinated and consolidated instead of increased in number; it is contrary to the idea of efficiency, which is so sorely needed, and the lack of which has been so often criticized on this floor.

Under my amendment the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy will be empowered to undertake the housing of the employees in the plants under their direct control. This bill provides \$50,000,000 to erect houses for the employees at the arsenals, at the navy yards, and in the war industries controlled by private corporations; but wherever the houses are to be built they will come directly under the contractual relations of either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

There is absolutely no reason to create a new building department at tremendous cost to the taxpayers, a new organization, causing confusion and conflict with the other departments; and why? Is the War Department equipped to build the houses at the plants where it is buying war munitions, or at its own arsenals? There is a construction division in the Council of National Defense with a thousand officers, expert engineers and construction experts, inspectors, draftsmen, and so forth. They have purchased machinery to construct the buildings for those departments. They have built 16 cantonments at a cost of \$138,000,000. They have contracted for and built \$338,000,000 worth of buildings for the War Department; and all of the physical construction of the buildings for the War Department has been placed under that division. They have prepared a contract which, after a year's experience, has been found to be economical and satisfactory to the contractors.

Is the Navy Department equipped to take over these activities? The Navy Department has the Bureau of Yards and Docks, with 400 engineers and construction experts. They have built an office building in this city containing 940,000 square feet. They have built the addition to the Academy at Annapolis. They have built \$120,000,000 worth of buildings. They can take care of these activities. They are in their stride, so to speak; and there is absolutely no excuse for creating another building department.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I am inclined to agree with the statements made by the Senator, and with the amendment which he has offered; but I wanted to ask the Senator whether, from his investigations or the investigations of his committee, he is satisfied that

the War Department in the erection of the cantonments has adopted plans that argue that it can construct these buildings cheaper than they could be constructed by some other agency? There has been considerable criticism that the War Department, through the cost-plus contracts, has incurred expenses and expenditures far beyond the benefits which have been derived; that the buildings have cost too much; that they have had too many instrumentalities and agencies, as a result of which the Government has not received a quid pro quo.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am very glad the Senator from Utah has raised that question. I quite realize that at the beginning of this war, when haste was the essential factor, when it was absolutely essential that we should house a draft army of nearly 700,000 men before the winter set in, these cantonments should be hastily constructed, and therefore they had to gather the labor from all points of the compass, they had to make their contracts in a hasty manner, and it is quite true that there was great extravagance and a lavish expenditure of money; but since that time, I am told, this construction division has been reorganized. They have improved their system of contracts. They have a fee system. They pay a fee to the architect and to the builder, and in the case of recent construction I understand that the cost has been very moderate; but this bill provides that the contracts shall be advertised for upon public bids. Therefore in the present situation the criticism of the Senator from Utah does not apply.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wanted to ask, if the Senator's amendment is adopted, will the building operations be conducted through the cantonment department presided over by Mr. W. K. Starrett?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand so, yes; and in the Navy Department under Admiral Parks.

Mr. President, there is another objection that I have to leaving the administration of this bill in the Department of Labor, and that is that it will create a serious situation in the War Department, and the Navy Department, and the Shipping Board.

The materials—lumber, brick, cement, and other building materials—produced in this country required for building are practically being exhausted by the needs of these departments, and it has been necessary to allocate these materials under priority arrangements. After much confusion and difficulty they have accomplished it, and these different departments now have an opportunity to procure the necessary amount of material for their building operations. Now you create another department and you are going to bring about a clash and a conflict which will cause more delay and greater blunders; and haste is the essential factor. The Bethlehem Steel Co., which is making our heavy and light artillery ammunition, can increase the capacity of that plant if it has four or five thousand more employees and it needs to house them; and I understand some of this money—several millions of it—is to be used to build houses at that plant.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. KING. Perhaps the question that I am about to propound is not germane to the discussion which the Senator is making. I have heard a good many criticisms, though, that there is no necessity for the erection of buildings by the Government; that the localities in which these industries are being carried on could, with some slight effort and by appeals to their patriotism, care for those who may be employed by the Government in Government activities. What I am afraid of is that if the Government starts upon a housing scheme every man who is doing some work for the Government, no matter where it is, no matter how remote, will appeal to the Government to house his employees, upon the ground that the houses that are furnished in towns or in the neighborhood are not sufficiently hygienic, that the sanitary arrangements are not adequate, that the Government ought to adopt better methods, and that those methods would be best carried on by the Government taking charge of the housing of all of the employees.

Does not the Senator think, from the evidence that was taken before his committee, that the corporations and individuals who have contracts with the Government in the various communities in which these industries are being carried on can, with some little persuasion and appeals to their patriotism, care for all of the employees that may be brought there?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I am in favor of better housing facilities, better hygienic and sanitary conditions, for the workingman, but we are engaged in a great war, and it is no time to indulge in sociological experiments. What we need is munitions and more munitions, and we need them quickly. While I believe in the English plan of making these houses permanent, so that they can be sold, I believe that they should be built hastily and economically, and only those necessary for the needs of the workingmen at these various plants.

Why, there are hundreds of men in this city to-day, from every locality in the country, anxious to get this money from the Government to build up their different localities, wherever there is a war munition plant, and for many of these projects there is absolutely no necessity. I understand that this \$50,000,000 is not to be limited to that, but that the motive of those who are back of it is to create great community centers, involving the expenditure of \$500,000,000, \$600,000,000, or possibly \$700,000,000 of the Government's money.

Now, this is a war emergency measure. We have no right at this time to stop to consider uplift questions. What we need is housing at these various plants as quickly and economically as we can get it, so that we can get the necessary amount of labor. We do not want to waste time with a lot of fancy architectural designs, the consideration of idealistic plans, when we need to house these men at once.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do.

Mr. KING. I do not think the Senator quite apprehended my view. I perfectly agree with him that this is not the time for any experiments in sociology or in the betterment of the conditions of the people. We are at war, and it is important that we should get munitions just as rapidly as possible; but the question that I asked the Senator was whether the investigations before the committee demonstrated that it was absolutely necessary, in order to obtain the munitions that the Government requires, that the Government should go into this experiment of building houses?

Apropos of what I have just said, if the Senator will pardon me, I have learned that some of these idealists are in these departments now, and that they have drawn elaborate plans for houses that would be suitable for men whose income was forty or fifty thousand dollars a year, with oak floors, and with magnificent furnishings—permanent houses. What I am afraid of is that if we do go into this housing business the matter will drift into the hands of some of these idealists and faddists, and we will have millions and hundreds of millions of dollars ultimately to pay for this experiment placed in the hands of irresponsible people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I think that if my amendment prevails, and the responsibility of building these houses—directly designed to increase the production of these various munition plants—is placed in the War and Navy Departments, those officers will see the practical side of this and build these houses as economically as possible, and only at those plants where they are necessary. Now, I have heard that that idealistic plan referred to by the able Senator from Utah exists in the Department of Labor, under Mr. Elditz; and that is what this bill is designed to bring about. It does not exist in the War and the Navy Departments. They are carrying on this war, and they see the practical side of it; and the only reason I have offered this amendment is because it is the only practical and businesslike way to build these houses; not that I have anything against the Department of Labor or their desire to control this situation. The only practical, businesslike way to do this thing is to put it in the departments that have control of these various war activities.

Why, think of this possible situation, Mr. President: Take an arsenal under the direction of the Secretary of War. These houses are erected, and they are rented under the direction of the Secretary of Labor. The plumbing needs repairing, or the houses need to be painted; is the manager of that arsenal to take charge of that? No. The Department of Labor have to be conferred with and their consent obtained first, because this bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall manage these houses. Take the Bethlehem Steel Co. plant, in charge of a superintendent responsible for furnishing our munitions. A man applies to him—an expert machinist, we will say—for employment. He says, "I can not come unless I can be housed"; but the superintendent of the Bethlehem Steel Co. has to confer with the Department of Labor before he can procure a house for his own employee.



Mr. President, if the Senate believes in efficiency, if it believes in coordination, if it believes in conserving the funds of this Government in the interest of the taxpayer and the bond buyer, it will vote for this amendment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the trouble about the Senator's amendment is that it does not cover the subject matter of the bill itself. If, in connection with it, he would move to strike out all after the words "United States," in line 7, down to the word "and," in line 8—that is, the words "and in industries connected with and essential to the national defense"—his argument as to placing the power in the hands of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and not in the hands of the Secretary of Labor nor in the President generally to allocate as he pleases, might have much more effect.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The jurisdiction under this act over plants where war industries are being carried on is over plants with which the Government now has contracts.

Mr. FALL. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, he is devoting his argument and his amendment entirely to one portion of the bill. The Navy purposes and the arsenals are specifically mentioned in the bill, and his amendment and his argument go to that particular phase of the bill; but there is a much broader proposition involved in this bill. The Senator must recall that Congress has been passing almost every day war legislation, and we have now declared every industry in the United States a necessary war industry. Agriculture itself, of course, is. Mining is. We have so defined it in specific language. Now, the only possible way to allocate the duties under this bill is by some central authority. I assume, of course, that the President of the United States would use the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War where it was necessary to vest the power in them under this bill. I presume that he would do that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand the Senator to state that these war industries are not under the control and direction of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. FALL. No; the Senator misunderstands me. For instance, take the words in the bill, "for such industrial workers as are engaged in arsenals and navy yards of the United States." Now, the workers in the arsenals, of course, are directly under or connected with the performance of the duties of the Secretary of War or some of his departments. In the navy yards of the United States, of course, they are directly connected with the Secretary of the Navy or some of his departments; but the industries connected with and essential to the national defense have been defined by the Congress of the United States to be every possible industry in the United States, including agriculture.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico further yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I understand, the only plants where these houses are to be constructed are those plants having large contracts with the War and Navy Departments, and where the houses are essential to increase the number of employees, so as to furnish the Government with its necessary equipment; and naturally, while the bill may be as broad and is as broad as the Senator says, the need, the good to be accomplished, is directly connected with those plants that are now controlled under contracts with the Government.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, does the Senator think it is a violent assumption for me to say that that being the case the President of the United States would leave the authority where it could be best executed?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I believe, Mr. President, that these two departments, having direct knowledge of their own needs and having construction divisions in those departments, are better equipped to administer this act than the President of the United States.

Mr. FALL. I agree thoroughly with the Senator that they have made some progress possibly in their particular line of industry or social uplift even, and that they might perform better service than some one else whom the President might discover or in whom he might vest this authority. However, this is a broad bill. Under the terms of it they can go into the

State of Arizona to-day, and without availing themselves of the authority vested heretofore by the Congress of the United States in the President, the President of the United States can take over the mines in Arizona. They can go into the State of Colorado, and availing themselves of the authority vested in the President of the United States they may take over every coal mine in that State. They can go into the State of West Virginia, into the State of Ohio, or Illinois, or Pennsylvania, and without taking over the mines themselves, as the President is authorized to do under the terms of what we know generally as the food act, under the terms of this bill the Secretary of Labor can take every house of every laborer engaged in these industries who is now at work, and if he chooses to do so he can say, "You are not a union-labor man, and therefore you will have to vacate the house, and I take charge of it and I rent it," and a union-labor card shall be necessary to be presented before the occupant can obtain work in the mine, because unless he can find a house to live in he can not work.

This may be a very violent assumption, and doubtless it is, but I want to say, in passing, I am inclined to believe at times, and I am not convinced at all it would not be for the best interests of this country, right now and in the future, if every laborer in the country belonged to a union-labor organization. I am inclined to think that possibly that is coming about, and I am not prepared to say that it would not be by odds the best for the country now and in the future if every laborer in the country was a member of a union-labor organization.

To-day, however, we are confronted with this condition, that less than 10 per cent of the laborers of the United States are members of labor unions, while in England they can deal collectively with labor unions because the labor unions constitute 90 per cent of the labor of the country. We are not in that condition now.

The Secretary of Labor declared one great duty of his office to be the building up of the union-labor organizations, as I understand it. He has not only declared that the one great duty of his office as Secretary of Labor was mediation and conciliation between employers and employees, but that mediation and conciliation meant dealing with men collectively, and to deal with them collectively meant that they must be unionized.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is the case, does not the Senator think that Mr. Wilson is secretary of union labor rather than Secretary of Labor?

Mr. FALL. I am afraid so. Of course, I can not speak for him except out of his own mouth. I have here his speech made at Seattle in 1913, on reading which I think the Senator would be justified in forming that conclusion, and from various other utterances of the Secretary. He may be right, as I said; it may be best in time of peace, it may be best in time of war, that labor in this country should be unionized. The only difficulty that I can see and the only objection I have to union labor now in this country is that union labor desires to be treated with collectively and refused to recognize collective responsibility.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not, Mr. President, the honor of the acquaintance of the Secretary of Labor. I have no doubt he is doing a good work in various directions, but I had occasion to notice that on several occasions where the Secretary of Labor addressed laboring men at mass meetings of laboring men, where it is to be presumed a majority of them were non-union men, he always addressed them as fellow labor unionists, which I thought was an unfortunate method that he had adopted, because he was talking to union men and to non-union men, but apparently only recognized the one class.

Mr. FALL. In my judgment, and it is my personal judgment, the Secretary of Labor has rather conceived it to be his duty, and as I said it may be best for the country, that he should assist in unionizing labor in this country and use his office for that purpose.

He may be right about it; it may be that would be for the best. But this is not the time to try it. You must not undertake now to unsettle all the business of the country and to upset the labor of the country even more than it is now upset by seeking to force by the strong arm of the law in war time the nonunion laborer into a union-labor camp into which it has refused to enter in peace time.

Mr. President, I do not say that the Secretary of Labor would do this, but his entire effort has been along this line in time of peace. He has seemed to think and has declared that it was the duty of his department to prevent the crushing of labor by the building up of union labor, and I do not know but that I shall now quote some of his expressions as published in the

New York Times of November 13, 1913, in addressing the Union Labor Congress of Seattle.

Mr. President, I do this in all friendliness, so far as I am concerned; but I desire to express now my disagreement with some of the theories, at least, advanced by the present Secretary of Labor in addressing the conference of the American Federation of Labor at Seattle. He referred specifically to the then strike in the copper mines in Michigan and dwelt on it at great length and announced the most peculiar theory in reference to the individual right of property which has been announced by anyone of whom I have any knowledge except an anarchist.

As the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] just said, in addressing this organization—which, however, was a union-labor organization—he addressed them as “fellow unionists.” Among other things, he said:

The Department of Labor as now organized and directed will be utilized to cooperate with the great trade-union movement in its effort to elevate the standard of human society.

One of the general duties imposed on the department is that of promoting the welfare of wage-workers.

I might stop to say, by way of comment, that that evidently referred to the general wage-working class, whether it belonged to the union or not. He continues:

The one great specific duty imposed on the department is to act as a mediator and to appoint commissioners of conciliation in trades disputes. There can be no mediation, there can be no conciliation between employers and employees, that does not presuppose collective bargaining, and there can not be collective bargaining that does not presuppose trade-unionism.

He speaks then of the situation at Calumet, Mich., and speaks of the great profits there. I have his words here. I do not think it is necessary to read them in full, but he speaks of the great profits they have made by one mine. He then concludes:

They say their property is their own; that they have the right to do with it as they please. Maybe they have, but those who take that position have a false conception of the titles to property.

He proceeds to discuss titles to property. This is quoting from the New York Times, and I will call attention to the direct quotations from the Secretary as to what he said:

The Secretary said every title was law created and law protected, and that, deprived of those laws, the property involved would be at the mercy of the first strong and cunning man who desired it.

Now, quoting from the Secretary:

“Law had created those titles,” he continued, “not primarily for the welfare of the man to whom it conveys it, but for the welfare of the community. Society has conceived, whether rightfully or wrongfully, that the best method of promoting the welfare of society is to convey titles to individuals in real estate and personal effects. It does it, however, not for the welfare of the individual, but for the welfare of the great mass of the people.”

“If any individual or corporation takes the ground that the property is his own, that he has the right to do with it as he pleases, and fails to take into consideration the fact that the title has only been conveyed to him as a trustee for the welfare of the society, then he is creating a condition that will cause society to modify or change these titles to property, as it has a perfect right to do whenever, in its judgment, it deems it for the welfare of society to do it.”

This is the end of the quotation.

In giving the figures which he did in this speech the inference which he drew was that because of the profits which were made by individual owners of mines society had a right to deprive those individuals of their property; that the profits made constituted the measure of the right of society to confiscate property.

Of course, Mr. President, no man has a right to burn his house. In that far he is a trustee of his property for the welfare of society. It is true that in a time of need or peril the United States or Government or society itself can take over individual property, but that is for the needs of Government itself; but the right of condemnation and the measure of that right is not the profit made by the owner. Otherwise you might say when two men are managing farms alongside one another under exactly the same conditions and one makes a profit of 50 per cent and the other only 5 per cent, under the theory advanced by the Secretary of Labor the man making 50 per cent profit owes his property to society, and therefore society can confiscate it because of the profit he makes out of it. Of course, that is nonsense in so far as our present state of society is concerned, and it would not be listened to with very much patience until we have gone further than we have yet gone in the line of not only State socialism but in the line, I may say, of Russian socialism, or bolshevism.

Mr. President, as I have said, the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey may be perfectly proper; it may be that it is best to vest in the Secretary of the Navy the power to provide housing facilities for all those engaged directly in naval work; it may be best to vest in the Secretary of War the housing facilities for all those engaged in arsenal work, as is expressly set forth in the bill, and not vest it in the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. President, I wander in the realms of speculation when I undertake to even imagine for a moment the result of the vast

power contained in the few words following “navy yards of the United States,” being the words “and in industries connected with and essential to the national defense.” As I said in opening, practically every industry now—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Government is going to pay for the houses, is it not, at the various industrial plants?

Mr. FALL. I presume so.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Then why should it not be under the control and charge of a Government official?

Mr. FALL. That is exactly what I am proposing, that the President of the United States shall be vested with the authority contained in the bill and allocate it as under the circumstances may seem best.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is the difference between the Senator and myself. The Senator believes that the President should do it. I believe that the Secretary of the department having control of the activities of that department should do it.

Mr. FALL. Then to be consistent the Senator should insert “the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior,” because the Secretary of the Interior has general charge of mines upon the public domain and the public lands and the Secretary of Agriculture has general charge of the agricultural industries of the country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN rose.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator desires, I will yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I can not see why the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior should have anything to do with this matter. I can see why the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War should do it, because they are buying munitions from these industries, which need more employees, and therefore the Government is going to build the houses for the employees at these industries. Therefore it does directly have some relation to them.

Mr. FALL. I know the Senator is very seriously impressed with the great necessity for housing employees in his State engaged there.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield further to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FALL. I will yield in a moment, if the Senator will allow me to conclude what I was saying. There the Senator is undoubtedly very familiar with the housing of naval employees and those engaged in arsenal work and munitions work, and so forth. That is a matter of absolute necessity which we all recognize. The Senator is familiar with the conditions there; but there are 48 States and there are 96 Senators here. The Senators from the other States are somewhat familiar with conditions existing in their States, and they are looking somewhat to what might occur throughout the United States and not only around the navy yards or arsenals. It is with these matters in view that I am speaking as I am. I have the utmost respect for the Senator from New Jersey, and for his sincerity. I know his eye is fixed on the navy yards and the employees engaged therein, and he does not sufficiently, in my judgment, take into consideration the fact that this bill vests the broadest powers that were ever attempted to be vested along this line in any authority. To be perfectly frank with the Senator, I believe the Secretary of the Navy is possibly more incapable of handling agricultural labor than would be the Secretary of Labor himself. I do not think that the Secretary of War is capable of handling any class of labor at all except those who labor with their mouths. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Bethlehem Steel Co. are now making 40 per cent of the munitions and heavy artillery for the Government. They could increase their capacity accordingly if \$7,000,000 were spent there for housing. The contracts are made by the Secretary of War and not by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior. That is a war-industries plant. There are many other plants from which the War Department and Navy Department are buying munitions. If the Government is to assist these war-industrial plants, these private corporations, to increase their capacity by increasing the number of their employees through housing facilities provided by the Government, the Government, being the largest customer of those plants and needing an increased supply of munitions, should have control over those plants, and the department making the contract with those industrial plants should have the control over those houses. That is the point I make.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I understand the Senator, I think, and I am very unfortunate that I can not make him understand me. I understand, further, that under the law as it exists to-



day the President of the United States can go to any private steel plant in the United States, the property of an individual, and commandeer it and take it over and operate it; he can fix the wages and pay the laborers and conduct the property. I understand that under the terms of this bill the President need not do that, but it will enable the Secretary of Labor to absolutely control that private plant by seizing all the housing facilities and taking charge of them.

Now, I am not in favor of vesting that power in the Secretary of Labor or the Secretary of the Navy, either. I am in favor of vesting it in the President of the United States, who stands before all the people of the United States as the representative of the administrative power in this country, and who sits, as he says, upon the true throne of administration in this country. I am willing to vest these extraordinary powers in him. Then the people will hold him responsible. I am willing to vest them in him, but not to provide that discrimination should be made or authority vested in this bill as between different classes of labor or laborers, because the people of the United States will hold him responsible.

There is a power far greater than that of the Congress of the United States. There is a power greater than that of the 48 States of the Union. There is a power greater than the President of the United States or the Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, and that is the residuum of power left by the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the people of the United States. That power can only be exercised by public opinion. Public opinion is the expression of that great residuum of power to which we listen and to whose command the President of the United States may bow.

I regard the informing function of Congress as the greatest function at this time. Through debate upon just such bills as this the people can learn of something that is going on, and through the passage of such bills as that yesterday, the people of the United States can understand that the President of the United States, whom they have elected and placed in the White House, is responsible directly to them and that they do not necessarily hold responsible his subordinate officers.

Mr. President, I want to clear it away so that that public opinion constituting the greatest force in this country may reach the President unimpeded. If it is necessary to vest these vast powers in some one to save this country, if it is necessary to go to a man on horseback, a military dictatorship, while I hope that we may avoid that necessity, I am willing to go as far as anyone. However, I do not want little petty politics, the consideration of union labor or any other class of labor, to enter into this proposition at all; and I have confidence enough in the President of the United States even yet to believe that when he assumes the personal responsibility under the authority vested in him directly that he will not yield to any such consideration as against the general welfare of the people of the United States. I have no such confidence in some of his subordinate officers.

Now, Mr. President, as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, I move to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor," page 1, line 3, and to insert in lieu thereof the word "President."

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I understand the vote will first come on the substitute offered by the Senator from New Mexico for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the correct situation.

Mr. SWANSON. There is this difference between the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico and the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey: The Senator from New Jersey simply desires to eliminate entirely the Secretary of Labor from any consideration or action in this matter and to confine it to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. The Senator from New Mexico would leave it to the President so that he may select the agencies that he thinks best to administer the law. The committee reported to give the power to the Secretary of Labor under the direction of the President, which is practically the same thing as the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I do not think the Secretary of Labor ought to be eliminated from having a part in this work. Under the existing conditions the Secretary of Labor has a large employment bureau, and if any of these large plants—navy yards, arsenals, or any of the great industrial plants—need labor the Secretary of Labor, with the agency he has, goes over the country and tries to get mechanics, tries to get labor. It was through his efforts to supply labor for these plants that he realized the conditions which exist at the great industrial centers. The labor would not remain at work. They would get an expert mechanic and he would stay there 30, 60, or 90 days and then

leave. Then they would have to go over and over the condition in what is known as turnover of labor. The Secretary of Labor made an examination with money furnished him by the President. He ascertained that the greatest trouble at the navy yards and arsenals and these industrial plants where war munitions are being manufactured is the deficiency in labor, the great turnover of labor, and that was occasioned by lack of housing facilities. He made a report, and that report was then taken to the Cabinet. Then there was another report, under money furnished by the President, of all the industrial centers, arsenals, navy yards, and where people had contracts with the War and Navy Departments. We have been complaining at the delay that has been occasioned. These reports were made and they are confidential—any Senator can see them—as to the conditions at the navy yards and arsenals and the places where guns, powder, munitions, and other things are being contracted for by the Government. The general impression is that from 25 to 50 per cent increase of output could be made if housing facilities were given.

This bill was introduced in the House. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House reported it unanimously after a long and full hearing of the various plans and purposes; and it was reported to the House of Representatives, and I think passed that body with but 17 votes against it. It came to the committee of which I am chairman. We had the Secretary of Labor before us. He told us of the plans, purposes, and intentions, and I wish to say that I do not think anybody who appeared before the committee made a better impression than the Secretary of Labor as to the conditions and how he expected to remedy them. Those hearings have been printed and have been here for two weeks.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Do I understand that the Secretary of Labor is to have control of the labor in the yards and arsenals?

Mr. SWANSON. Not the labor; he simply procures labor. For instance, where they need 5,000 workmen he tries to get them. He tries to ascertain where there is a superabundance of labor. He has been trying to do that ever since the war started.

Mr. LODGE. But he has no control over it.

Mr. SWANSON. He has no control over it. I never said that he had control. In doing this work he ascertains the conditions at the plant. He made a report that there was a great turnover of labor. You get hundreds of mechanics and you get experts. They were at first green, not acquainted with the work, but many experts would leave and others would come, and this is due to the housing conditions. Great Britain has spent \$700,000,000 for housing at munition plants. I understand this matter was discussed in the Cabinet. It was discussed by the Secretary of Labor and by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and a conclusion was reached that the Secretary of Labor is the best person to administer it. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy agreed that the Secretary of Labor should do it under the direction of the President.

I understand that they have already selected a man for the Navy Department who will represent the Navy and a man for the War Department to represent the Army and a man from the Shipping Board whom the Secretary of Labor has selected. If left to the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy there would be three to administer it. I have no objection to leaving it to the President and let the President select them, but I am unwilling to have the Secretary of Labor entirely eliminated when he has made these surveys, knows the conditions, and is engaged now in getting employees to go to the plants. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey would eliminate him entirely and get rid of the work he has done. He has done this work efficiently and he impressed me very favorably, indeed.

Consequently, as between the substitute offered by the Senator from New Mexico and the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey I shall vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from New Mexico, because the Senator from New Mexico proposes to leave it to the President. That does not necessarily exclude the Secretary of Labor, who has done great work. If the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey prevails, the Secretary of Labor is excluded, the work he has done is eliminated, and the work that he has done has been valuable and efficient. He has been a very great source of strength to the Army and Navy at the arsenals and munition plants engaged in war production. He knows the conditions. What he has done is valuable and he should be included in it. I think it is wrong to endeavor to eliminate him from this bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, several Senators are absent from the Chamber who wish to be present when the vote is taken, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	New	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Gronna	Norris	Smoot
Brandeggee	Hardwick	Overman	Sutherland
Calder	Hitchcock	Page	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Polindexter	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Pomerene	Trammell
Dillingham	King	Reed	Underwood
Fall	Kirby	Shafroth	Vardaman
Fernald	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Fletcher	McKellar	Sherman	Watson
France	McLean	Shields	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Martin	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is therefore shown not to be present, and the Secretary will call the names of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. HENDERSON and Mr. NUGENT answered to their names when called.

Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. TILLMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of California entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is upon the adoption of the substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the effect of which will be to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and to insert the words "President of the United States," that being the substitute proposed to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from New Jersey offers his amendment to the text of the bill, and for that amendment the Senator from New Mexico has offered a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair only stated the effect of the substitute to be to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and to insert the words "President of the United States."

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask that the substitute be read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN offers an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "the," to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and to insert "Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy," and Mr. FALL offers as a substitute for the amendment of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor," on page 1, line 3, and to insert the words "President of the United States" in lieu thereof.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, the vote will first come upon the substitute proposed by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote will first come upon the substitute to insert the words "President of the United States." The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that the amendment proposed by the committee, to insert the words "under the direction of the President of the United States," would seem now to be surplusage and should be disagreed to. They are now neither germane nor necessary.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Does the Chair refer to my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at all. The Senator's amendment has been disposed of.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I merely wish the right to offer the amendment in the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. The words "under the direction of the President" should be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are not necessary.

Mr. LODGE. I may not have caught it, and I ask has the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, as amended by the substitute of the Senator from New Mexico, been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. The RECORD will not show it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey as amended by the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment, which does not appear now to be necessary. Without objection, it is rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when this bill was previously under consideration I called the attention of the Senator from Virginia to what I thought was unfortunate phraseology. The Senator was not in a very amiable frame of mind on that day, and he paid little attention to my suggestion.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from New Hampshire evidently was not observing; he certainly had some one else in view.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want now to make a suggestion, to which I think the Senator from Virginia will agree. I suggest to transfer the words "and their families," on page 1, at the end of line 8, to come in after the words "United States," in line 7. I trust the Senator will read the language, and I think he will see that that will be a desirable change.

Mr. THOMAS. Should not the words come in after the word "workers," in line 6, so as to read "such industrial workers and their families"?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; as I suggest, it would read "such industrial workers as are engaged in arsenals and navy yards of the United States and their families." I think the words "and their families" would better come in after the words "United States."

Mr. SWANSON. It will be all right in that way. I will say that this language came over in the bill from the other House, and we did not feel that we should act as a committee of censorship on that body.

Mr. GALLINGER. I feel like amending any bill that comes here from the other House, especially one that is drawn by a blacksmith, as I think this bill was.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move the amendment which I have stated, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, in section 1, page 1, line 6, after the word "arsenals," to insert "and navy yards," so as to read:

And other community facilities for such industrial workers as are engaged in arsenals and navy yards of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in the same section, on the same page, line 9, before the word "employees," to insert "also," so as to read:

And also employees of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a very important amendment was adopted when this bill was previously under consideration, being first offered by myself and afterwards by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. In view of the action of the Senate a few moments ago, whereby all that had been accomplished heretofore in the consideration of this bill was set aside, I now ask for a reconsideration of the amendment that was adopted upon the motion of the Senator from Minnesota, a copy of which I understand the Secretary has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The whole matter, as the Chair understands, has been reconsidered.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that; and for that reason I am offering the amendment hitherto offered by the Senator from Minnesota and accepted by the Senate in order that we may adopt it again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out the proviso following the word "constructed," in line 15, and to insert the following:

*Provided, That colleges, museums, libraries, State or municipal buildings and the furnishings in private dwellings shall not be acquired except by contract, nor shall any occupied dwelling be taken under the powers in this act given except by contract unless the necessity thereof shall be determined by a judge of the circuit or district court of the United States exercising jurisdiction in the locality on petition setting forth the reason and necessity for such taking; the hearing on such petition shall be summary in character, and the determination of such judge shall be final.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], proposed as a substitute for the committee amendment beginning on line 15, page 2, and extending to the bottom of the page.

Mr. SWANSON. I accept that amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment, to come in after the word "final," which I believe is the last word in the proposed substitute.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. At the end of the amendment just stated, following the word "final," it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "but in no event shall any occupied dwelling house be taken except by contract, unless such dwelling be upon lands desired for the construction of a Government structure."

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that being adopted for consideration by the conferees. I think it is all right.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the amendment to the amendment again be read.

The amendment to the amendment was again read.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that the entire amendment be read with the amendment which I have proposed added to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment as proposed to be amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

*Provided, That colleges, museums, libraries, state or municipal buildings and the furnishings in private dwellings shall not be acquired except by contract, nor shall any occupied dwelling be taken under the powers in this act given except by contract unless the necessity thereof shall be determined by a judge of the circuit or district court of the United States exercising jurisdiction in the locality on petition setting forth the reason and necessity for such taking; the hearing on such petition shall be summary in character and the determination of such judge shall be final, but in no event shall any occupied dwelling house be taken except by contract unless such dwelling be upon lands desired for the construction of a Government structure.*

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator to insert the word "private," so as to read "private occupied dwelling house," because in some cases where there are summer hotels, for instance, it is the intention to take them—

Mr. JONES of Washington. "Private occupied dwelling house"—that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. SWANSON. But there is an intention in the case of some of the summer hotels which are not occupied except for two or three months during the year, and which are capable of housing hundreds and thousands of workmen, to take them for the purposes intended by this bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is all right.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to state the purpose of the amendment in just a word.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The purpose of the amendment is to prevent the taking of a dwelling house, putting its occupants out, and merely putting somebody else in that house.

Mr. SWANSON. There is no intention of doing that; that was testified to before the committee; and I have no objection to the amendment if it is made to apply only to private residences.

Mr. JONES of Washington. "Occupied private dwelling house," I think, will cover the idea.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the amendment to the amendment is rather contradictory of the preceding portion of the amendment. The suggestion of the Senator from Washington, if I correctly apprehend it, virtually eliminates private dwellings from the operation of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. THOMAS. I may be; but that is the effect of it, as it appears to me.

Mr. SWANSON. There is an exception in case it is intended to erect thereon a Government structure.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I understand that; but under the amendment which was offered on a preceding occasion by the Senator from Minnesota, occupied dwellings could be taken either by contract or by an order of the district judge of the particular district in a summary proceeding.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They can be taken here on the order of a judge if the land is necessary for the purposes covered by the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. But only under those circumstances.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is true.

Mr. THOMAS. And that eliminates from the bill all other structures which are used for dwellings.

Mr. SWANSON. I think it would be well to carry out the purpose of the Senator from Washington, but the objection of the Senator from Colorado should certainly be considered. It might be well to insert in the amendment to the amendment a qualification to the effect that a private dwelling can be taken if the surrounding land is desired by the Government. For instance, such a case as this may arise, and the Government ought not to be subject to blackmail or extortion: In some of these places it will be necessary to have thousands of employees in order to insure the production of war material, and I think it is expected to build in some instances small villages or towns to house and take care of the employees. Now, there might be five

or six houses in such a place, and under the language as drawn, unless the Government intended to build over those lands, they could not take the dwellings. There is no purpose in any of the cities to transfer a house from A and give it to B; it has been testified that that is not the intention; but there are certain cases where the Government will probably desire to build two or three thousand houses, and the conditions might be such that it would be necessary to provide waterworks or an electric plant on the land occupied by a private dwelling, and the proposed amendment to the amendment might really destroy the whole program in a given case unless it were so framed as to take care of such a situation. If the amendment is so drawn as to take care of cases like that, I think it would be a very proper amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what was intended. I did not have before me the original amendment, which was adopted some days ago, so as to frame the amendment to the amendment in connection with it, and I drew the amendment to the amendment in a hurry; but the Senator from Virginia has stated the idea that I want to cover, and I would be perfectly willing to have it adopted in some such form and let it go to conference. Any language that will cover the idea that I had in mind will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest that the amendment be read. If the Senator from Colorado is right, it might be very embarrassing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the amendment proposed by Mr. THOMAS it is proposed to insert the following:

*But in no event shall any occupied private dwelling house be taken except by contract, unless such dwelling be upon lands desired for the construction of a Government structure.*

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest that it be amended so as to read "unless such dwelling and surrounding land," and so forth.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has suggested to me that the amendment which was adopted as offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] some days ago provides an opportunity for a hearing by the owner of the premises involved and the right to file an answer to the summary proceedings. That does not appear in the amendment read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary only read the amendment to the amendment, the Chair will state. The amendment was proposed, and then an amendment to the amendment, which was read.

Mr. THOMAS. But the Secretary read the amendment which had been adopted when this bill was up last week, and that amendment the Senator from New Mexico advises me was sufficiently broad to permit the owner of the property to file an answer and be heard. As read, the amendment does not seem to have that provision in it.

Mr. LODGE. That was put in the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota some days ago.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but it was not in the amendment read by the Secretary.

Mr. LODGE. Then, it was incorrectly read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment again.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators who were present when the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota was adopted some days ago to the fact that I suggested at that time that there should be some notice given of the hearing. So, after the word "petition," as it appeared in the committee amendment on page 22, my recollection is that there was inserted by unanimous consent the words "and after notice," so that it read:

*unless the necessity thereof shall be determined by a judge of the circuit or district court of the United States exercising jurisdiction in the locality, on petition and after notice, setting forth the reasons and necessity for such taking.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to propose the amendment with the words now suggested by the Senator from New Mexico included?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; Mr. President, I think those words should be included in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then, the amendment will be considered as so modified.

Mr. FALL. The words "and after notice" should be inserted after the word "petition."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the original amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

*Provided, That colleges, museums, libraries, State or municipal buildings, and the furnishings in private dwellings shall not be acquired except by contract, nor shall any occupied dwelling be taken under the*

powers in this act given except by contract, unless the necessity thereof shall be determined by a judge of the circuit or district of the United States exercising jurisdiction in the locality, on petition setting forth the reason and necessity for such taking; the hearing on such petition shall be upon notice to the owner and occupant of such dwelling, and the determination of such judge shall be final.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That seems to include the words indicated by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SWANSON. Now I ask the Secretary to read the amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add the following to the amendment just read:

But in no event shall any occupied private dwelling house and the adjacent land be taken except by contract, unless such dwelling be upon lands desired for the construction of a Government structure.

Mr. SWANSON. That is wrong.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The words "adjacent land" have been put in the wrong place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That seems to conflict in any event with the purpose of the main amendment, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is only stating his own construction of the amendment. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. Let it be again read.

Mr. FALL. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FALL. The amendment which was adopted last week has just been read and appears to be satisfactory, except in so far as it is desired to amend it now; but the amendment which has been adopted by the Senate now is not the amendment which was adopted last week with the provision inserting the words "after notice."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is laboring under a misapprehension. No amendment has been adopted. An amendment that was heretofore adopted and then reconsidered has been proposed again by the Senator from Colorado and is now pending. To that amendment the Senator from Washington has offered an amendment.

Mr. FALL. What I desire to know is whether the amendment now pending is the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota as amended last week?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the same.

Mr. SWANSON. It is the same without amendment.

Mr. FALL. The original amendment of the Senator from Minnesota did not contain the words "after notice," and the original amendment was amended in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the same amendment as modified and perfected.

Mr. SWANSON. It is the amendment that was finally adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. Let the amendment be stated again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator like the whole amendment to be read?

Mr. SWANSON. No; simply the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest the Secretary read it, and then that the Senator from Virginia put in the words he desires at the proper place. It is pretty hard to express the idea.

The Secretary read as follows:

But in no event shall any occupied dwelling house be taken except by contract unless such dwelling be upon lands desired for the construction of Government property.

Mr. SWANSON. "Or adjacent land."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I may be obtuse, but I can not escape the conviction that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington defeats, in part, the purpose that is to be conserved by the amendment which I revived.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me, the amendment as adopted by the Senate as amended permitted the Government to take a house from A and give it to B if the court decided the Government might use it.

Mr. THOMAS. Precisely.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Washington desires to eliminate that authority, except in cases where the Government desires to take that private residence and construct there or upon adjacent lands buildings of its own. In a case like that the Government could take the private residence under the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. That fortifies my understanding of the amendment. Now, Mr. President, if housing is a matter of such

great concern, I think we ought not to limit the Government to the taking of structures which are not occupied, but we should permit the Government to take those which are occupied and which the Government needs far more, perhaps, than the occupants.

The amendment which was adopted the other day made ample provision whereby such structures, if needed, could be secured by contract. Failing in an agreement, a summary proceeding was provided for, and the decision of the judge of the United States court having jurisdiction of that proceeding is summarily made, and is final. Now, the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington certainly destroys that part of the amendment, because in no case can an occupied dwelling be taken under this law if the Senator's addition to the amendment is adopted, except by contract, unless in cases where the land may be needed as a part of a general system of construction.

I do not think we should narrow the operation of this bill in so small a compass, because it will certainly prove inconvenient, if not extremely annoying, and it may perhaps in some places defeat the immediate operation of the bill. I do not think the addition to the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to say just a word.

I do not see what conditions could arise in connection with the war that should cause us to take one family out of a house and put another family in it. The sole purpose of this amendment is just to prevent the exercise of power in that way. But there may be cases where there is a tract of land that the Government wants, upon which there is a private dwelling occupied by a family. This amendment permits the taking of that private dwelling for the purpose of putting a Government structure upon it and any surrounding lands that there may be; and that is the situation that it is hoped to meet. I do want to limit the general amendment proposed to that extent. I think it ought to be done; and, as the chairman has said, it was testified in the hearing that they do not want the power to put A out of his house and put B in it.

The language of this amendment, of course, was framed hurriedly; and while it may not exactly cover the situation, I think it could be worked out so as to meet the idea of the chairman, which is the very idea that I want to meet.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am gratified to know that I understand the object of the Senator perfectly. I disagree with him in his conclusion that there are not conditions, and may not hereafter be conditions, which would justify the ousting of one family from a house and a provision for its occupancy by some other family. We judge of these matters to some degree by conditions here in the city of Washington, which perhaps is an extreme example of congestion. There are a great many people in the city of Washington who might just as well be somewhere else, and, so far as the welfare of the country is concerned, they ought to be somewhere else.

In saying that, I do not intend to reflect upon that class of people; but I suppose Washington is to-day the most congested city in the Union, and it is due to the very rapid expansion of our various bureaus and organizations consequent upon our declaration of war. There are a great many people in Washington who are here because they like to be here. The excitement, the surroundings, and the atmosphere of Washington are congenial to them. That is all right in times of peace, but in times like these that class of people, well to do for the most part, can better serve their country by being somewhere else, and if they are not disposed to go willingly, then the Government ought to be empowered to take the houses which they occupy and devote them to the shelter of the employees of the Government who must be here; and in that event, of course, the people whose business does not require them to be here must go somewhere else. Indeed, I think it would be a very good idea if the President of the United States should issue a proclamation requesting all people in the city of Washington who do not permanently reside here, and who have no business here, to get out. That would relieve the congestion and enable a great many people who hardly have places where they can find shelter now to secure some sort of a habitation. It would be better for the Government and it would be better for the people against whom the proclamation is aimed.

In this city, therefore, Mr. President, the power should be given to whoever is to administer this bill to go to such occupants and say: "Here, I want to make a contract with you for the occupancy of this house. You are not obliged to be here, but the people for whom I want it must be here; and if I can not contract for possession, then I must summon you before the judge of the United States court and let him determine whether the necessities of the public are or are not greater than your convenience."



Of course, if this proposed amendment to the amendment is adopted, that method of relief in cities like Washington will be practically eliminated from the operation of this bill; and as a result those in whose behalf we propose to enact this legislation must wait until structures can be erected for them, and they will be unable to obtain shelter until they are erected. If housing is so much needed, Mr. President—if shelter for the employees of the Government, the workmen at these various industrial institutions, can only be obtained through Government aid—then we ought to pass a bill that will enable those administering the law to take houses which are already in existence as well as to build houses for those who are to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Upon a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs upon the adoption of the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Chair advise me what disposition has been made of the committee amendment on page 2, lines 6 and 7?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been acted upon. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is the committee amendment proposing to strike out, on page 2, lines 6 and 7, the words "local transportation and other community facilities and parts thereof."

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the object of this amendment is to permit the President of the United States to take over local transportation and other community facilities, or parts thereof, in any given place where it may be found necessary to provide housing facilities for Government employees. It would seem to me that this language is very necessary in the bill.

I recall that when the Senate considered legislation dealing with the construction of houses for men employed in the shipyards of the Nation, the Senate also considered another bill dealing with the transportation question. For several weeks I objected to the consideration of that transportation legislation until, after a careful examination of the whole subject, I became convinced that it was necessary to permit the Shipping Board, if they were to go into the housing business, also to have some authority to take over transportation facilities. As the result of this legislation, we have been able to avoid taking up this housing question in many places where it would otherwise be necessary. Some local trolley lines have been taken over and some have been extended, and we have been able to take men to shipyards located several miles from cities where houses could be had, thereby avoiding the expenditure of large sums of money for the construction of houses.

I think this committee amendment ought not to be agreed to. I really believe that it would be better to have the language in the bill than to have it stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On the same page, lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to strike out the words "local transportation, and other community facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next committee amendment is on page 3, lines 3 and 4, where it is proposed to strike out the words "local transportation, and other community facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 7, before the word "lien," it is proposed to insert the word "first."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On the same page, lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to strike out the words "local transportation, and other community facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I want to offer an amendment, to go at the end of line 13, paragraph (d).

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, preceding that I should like to offer an amendment, which I think the chairman of the committee will agree ought to go in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I withhold my amendment until the Senator offers his.

Mr. GALLINGER. I send the amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 8, after the word "money," it is proposed to add the following:

*And provided further*, That in no case shall any property hereby acquired be given away, nor shall rents be furnished free; but the rental charges shall be reasonable and just as between the employees and the Government.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to that. That is the purpose of those who will administer the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] asked me to present an amendment, which he understood the chairman of the committee would accept.

Mr. LODGE. My amendment comes in on line 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts is possibly a little fuller than the one to which the Senator from Washington refers and is practically of the same character.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have my amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 13, after the word "determine," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

*Provided*, That no loan shall be made at a less rate of interest than 5 per cent per annum: *And provided further*, That no loan shall be made and no house or money given under this act to any person not an American citizen.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LODGE. Does it relate to this amendment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may relate to that amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from New Mexico, as I understand, wanted an amendment inserted to the effect that the loans must be secured.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That they shall be properly secured by lien, mortgage, or otherwise.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I think that ought to be put in, to make it harmonize with the preceding paragraph—"without reserving a first lien."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it proposed as an amendment there?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts be read, and then he will see where it would be proper for the language to come in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again state the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 13, after the word "determine," it is proposed to add the following:

*Provided*, That no loan shall be made at a less rate of interest than 5 per cent per annum: *And provided further*, That no loan shall be made and no house or money given under this act to any person not an American citizen.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that that would properly come in after the words "per annum"—"and properly secured by lien, mortgage, or otherwise."

Mr. LODGE. It would go in right after the word "loan."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's suggestion is adopted as a part of his amendment. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, as modified.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that it be read in its modified form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. As modified, the amendment reads:

*Provided*, That no loan shall be made at a less rate of interest than 5 per cent per annum, and such loan shall be properly secured by lien, mortgage, or otherwise: *And provided further*, That no loan shall be made and no house or money given under this act to any person not an American citizen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator having charge of the bill to the words "or otherwise," which appear on page 2, line 5, and the same words upon line 11 of page 2. By reading the first clause their connection with the sentence in both cases will be apparent:

To purchase, acquire by lease, construct, requisition, or acquire by condemnation or otherwise such houses, buildings, furnishings, improvements—

And so forth. Mr. President, I am not aware of any other manner of acquiring property than by purchase, lease, construction, requisition, or condemnation.

Mr. SWANSON. That was put in there because it is generally put in legal documents, to cover gifts.

Mr. THOMAS. I would prefer to see the words "or gift" inserted, then. The word "otherwise" is an extremely broad one.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will move to amend by putting in the words "or by gift," I have no objection, and then the words "or otherwise" can be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment proposed is agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. If that amendment is accepted, of course, I do not care to occupy the time of the Senate in its discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment proposed by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, lines 6 and 7, it is proposed to strike out the words "what is commonly known as the Maltby Building, as well as all other" and to insert "all," so as to read:

(e) To take possession of, alter, repair, improve, and suitably arrange for living purposes to be used under the terms of this act all houses on square 633, owned by the United States, together with any other houses in the District of Columbia owned by the Government and not now occupied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, recurring to the amendment adopted upon the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], I should like to have the Chair state where that amendment comes in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that it was proposed to strike out "or otherwise" and insert "by gift."

Mr. SWANSON. Wherever those words occur in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. They occur in two or three places.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 5—

Mr. THOMAS. And on page 2, line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Wherever the expression occurs.

Mr. SWANSON. Wherever it occurs; I hope the Secretary will make the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered. Wherever it occurs, the Secretary will strike out "or otherwise" and insert "by gift."

Mr. THOMAS. And also on page 4, line 20.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in connection with the part of paragraph (e), where we have just stricken out the words "Maltby Building," and where it goes on "all houses on square 633, owned by the United States, together with any other houses in the District of Columbia owned by the Government and not now occupied," I should like to ask the Senator why the Government should not have a right to take and use the unoccupied embassies of Austria and Germany? I should not think of proposing that we should take the property of the late ambassadors here, as Germany has taken the property of Mr. Gerard, because I do not think we would want to be thieves even in time of war; but why should we not use those great unoccupied houses for our own purposes?

Mr. SWANSON. The bill does not include any specific houses. None have been named.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; but this is limited to houses owned by the Government and not now occupied.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, this was simply the Maltby Building that was included, and we expected to change that into a residential building. It was ascertained that it would take \$120,000.

Mr. LODGE. I was not objecting to that.

Mr. SWANSON. The other part was to take buildings out here that belonged to the Government.

Mr. LODGE. So I understand.

Mr. SWANSON. We have not named any buildings here; and if any buildings are to be condemned or acquired, by purchase or otherwise, in the District of Columbia, by the provisions of the bill before the act becomes operative they must make a specific report to Congress and Congress must make the appropriations. If the Senator desires these buildings to be taken under the provisions of this bill he can have a report made. They are authorized to spend \$10,000,000 to sequester buildings in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator misconceives my purpose. I only wanted to give the Government the authority if they have not the authority already.

Mr. SWANSON. The Government has authority under this bill.

Mr. LODGE. Then I will allow the suggestion to stand that we use those two embassies.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, what action has been taken by the Imperial German Government as to the property of Ambassador Gerard?

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, they have seized his property. He had no house there.

Mr. PHELAN. His personal property?

Mr. LODGE. His personal property, which was stored there, has been seized. I am not proposing to seize any of the personal property of the Austrian ambassador or the German ambassador; I do not know that they have any here; but there are those two large, empty houses. Why should we not have the benefit of them during the war?

Mr. PHELAN. Is the fee in the respective Governments?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; they own them. I understand so. I know that is the case with the German Embassy, and I think it is the case with the Austrian Embassy.

Mr. PHELAN. It would be like the acquisition of foreign territory here.

Mr. SWANSON. We have an alien enemy act here which permits all that property to be controlled. That bill was passed long before this bill was introduced. It is alien enemy property, and a law has been passed which will enable the Government to dispose of it.

Mr. LODGE. Well, I hope they will; that is all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is on page 3, line 21, where, after the words "Secretary of Labor," it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "with the approval of the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds," so as to read:

The Secretary of Labor, with the approval of the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, shall, in the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia, make use of any lands owned by the Government of the United States deemed by him to be suitable for the purpose—

And so forth.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I desire to strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the President"; also to strike out "with the approval of the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds."

Mr. LODGE. In other words, the Senator withdraws that amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. I withdraw that amendment and move to substitute the word "President" for the words "Secretary of Labor."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will not the chairman of the committee make that motion apply to the entire bill—that wherever the words "Secretary of Labor" occur they shall be stricken out and the word "President" inserted?

Mr. SWANSON. We can do that as we reach the different places in the bill.

Mr. FALL. Wherever the phrase occurs in the bill, I suggest that "Secretary of Labor" be stricken out and "President" inserted.

Mr. SWANSON. That should be done in each case as we reach it. We are reading the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to withdraw the amendment proposing to insert "with the approval of the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that amendment offered by the committee is rejected. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is on page 4—

Mr. SWANSON. On page 4, line 3, I move to strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the President."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and insert the word "President."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Also, on line 13, I move to strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert "President."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. What has become of the committee amendment in lines 6, 7, 8, and 9?



Mr. FALL. I suggest to the chairman that that amendment should be made on line 18 also.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; also on line 18.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is an amendment here that we have not dealt with, striking out the proviso in lines 6, 7, 8, and 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has not been reached yet.

Mr. LODGE. We have gone to lines 13 and 18. I thought we had passed over it.

The SECRETARY. On lines 6, 7, 8, and 9 it is proposed to strike out the words:

*Provided, That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of only a temporary character whenever it is practicable.*

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the committee will not insist on that amendment.

The chairman of the committee the other day, on April 17, in discussing this very proposition said that it was the purpose of the committee to leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, as the bill read at that time, to erect either permanent or temporary buildings, as he might deem proper. In my judgment, that is the way it should be; but this amendment, striking out the language read by the Secretary, would take away from the department or the President, as the bill now reads, the authority to put up temporary structures; and it seems to me the only construction which could be placed upon the bill, with that language eliminated, would be to have all the structures permanent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the language "whenever it is practicable" would give the President the right to construct a permanent building if it was imperative, so I agree with the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the observation of the Senator from New Hampshire is absolutely correct. Of course, we are only providing for these housing privileges because of the necessities of the war. I can understand, where we have arsenals and other industries connected with the War or Navy Departments, that it might be advisable to have permanent, substantial structures, and wherever such a case exists I want the structures to be permanent; but in many places there will be additional labor required for a year or two years or at most during the continuance of the war, and it does seem to me that common prudence would suggest that there should be nothing more than a temporary structure in cases of that kind.

A little matter came to my attention the other day. My colleague [Mr. HARDING] referred to it on yesterday. The committee having charge of the housing projects under the pending legislation prepared certain specifications for building, and they had printed certain regulations in which it was provided that none but a very excellent quality of cast-iron sewer pipe should be used. It so happens that in my own State there are large concerns that are interested in the manufacture of vitrified sewer pipe. This piping is approved by nearly all of the municipalities in our State and elsewhere in that vicinity. It may be that there are certain localities where none but steel or cast-iron pipe should be used; but it certainly does seem to me that any pipe should be used which would meet with the approval of the local authorities. The vitrified sewer pipe is much cheaper than the iron or steel pipe; and why any man in charge of this building project should say that only iron or steel pipe can be used is beyond my comprehension. If they were to build all permanent structures there might be some excuse for it, but I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will not insist upon that amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this provision in the House bill says that they shall put up temporary buildings wherever practicable. It leaves a certain amount of discretion, but it would make it the subject of a great deal of comment if the authorities put up any permanent buildings anywhere. The language was stronger than was really deemed advisable where they wanted to put up permanent buildings. A part of the employees in the arsenals and navy yards are willing at once to buy their buildings, pay a certain amount of cash, and make the remaining payments in installments. They had an idea that in places like that they ought to put up permanent buildings. A permanent wooden structure can be put up nearly as quickly as a temporary building, and the Government would not lose any money. It was thought wise to leave it discretionary with them to put up either temporary or permanent buildings, as they thought the situation required.

Mr. POMERENE. Then why did not—

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, take a place where you expect the population to be reduced one-half when the war is over. It would be absolute folly to put up permanent buildings there. They would not sell for more than temporary buildings and yet the cost is three and four times what it would

be in ordinary times. They expect to put up temporary buildings at such places, while at the Boston Navy Yard, the Philadelphia Navy Yard, the Mare Island Navy Yard, at Charleston, and Norfolk they can put up permanent buildings and the employees are willing to buy them.

All that is desired is that there shall be a discretion lodged with them to determine whether it is wise at a given place to put up permanent or temporary buildings. The language was such that they felt that unless it was impracticable or nearly impossible to put up temporary buildings they would have to put up permanent buildings.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator who felt that way?

Mr. SWANSON. Those who are to have the administration of it who appeared before the committee.

Mr. POMERENE. Who are they?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Eldlitz and others.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes, Mr. President; and I think I can shed a little bit of light upon that. Some of these material men came to see me and wanted me to support this committee amendment, because they said they wanted permanent structures everywhere, and quoted the British authorities to the effect that they had discovered that none but permanent structures should be used.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I have not seen any material man. No material man appeared before the committee. The Secretary of Labor, in discussing this matter, said that Great Britain spent \$700,000,000 for permanent buildings. He did not think it practicable in America, because Great Britain is a small country and permanent buildings with the large population could be quickly disposed of, and that most of the buildings would be temporary, but there are places where permanent buildings ought to be put up. Unless you are going to have an immense loss, if you put up temporary buildings in Philadelphia, there would be an absolute loss; if you put them up at Mare Island it would be a loss; if you put them up at Puget Sound it would be a loss. But in the majority of places the buildings should be temporary. I find lumber people are anxious to have temporary buildings. No material men and no lumbermen appeared before the committee or applied to me. The only suggestion which was made was by people who expect to administer this law, who think they ought to have discretion to take what is best for each place. If the Senator will offer an amendment which will do that, that is all I desire.

Mr. POMERENE. The language of the House bill if left alone will provide exactly what the Senator is now working for.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to this language. All I want is to have the discretion left with them.

Mr. POMERENE. This would leave the discretion with them.

Mr. SWANSON. But it is so strong that it would be hard to put up permanent buildings anywhere.

Mr. POMERENE. No; not at all.

Mr. SWANSON. It reads this way:

*Provided, That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of either permanent or temporary character, as is most practicable.*

Mr. POMERENE. I have not any objection to the language if it assumes that form.

Mr. SWANSON. I would prefer to eliminate it. Otherwise it might leave it that they should prefer permanent buildings.

Mr. POMERENE. I think common horse sense used by the department and by those in charge of this building will determine the question as to whether we ought to have permanent buildings in a given locality.

Mr. SWANSON. I would suggest this amendment, and it is all anyone desires:

*Provided, That the houses erected by the Government under authority of this act shall be of either permanent or temporary character, as is most practicable.*

Mr. POMERENE. I have no objection to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am going to venture to suggest to the Senator, though his suggestion may be better than mine, that it should read:

*That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of a temporary character unless otherwise determined by the President.*

Mr. SWANSON. That would lead to long delays, I fear. There are a great many of these employees who have the money to pay in part for the houses and all they ask is the privilege of purchasing these buildings. It will not cost the Government anything. At some of the places the buildings are going to be permanent, but it seems to me wise to leave it to be determined whether they shall be temporary or permanent according to the conditions.

I offer this as a substitute:

*Provided, That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of permanent or of temporary character as is most practicable.*

Mr. KING. Will not the Senator accept this?—

*Provided*, That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of only a temporary character, except where the interests of the Government will be best subserved.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection whatever to that amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. That sounds better.

Mr. SWANSON. I will accept it.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask that the amendment be read as now stated by the Senator from Utah.

The SECRETARY. Strike out and insert:

*Provided*, That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of only a temporary character, except where the interests of the Government will be best subserved.

Mr. GALLINGER. Be best subserved by what?

Mr. POMERENE. By buildings of a permanent character.

Mr. KING. I thought that was covered by the language of the bill.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Ohio has said. I have prepared an amendment along that line which I think perhaps covers the ground somewhat more fully than that offered by the Senator from Utah, if the Senator from Ohio will yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, at the end of line 13, insert the following:

*Provided*, That where it shall be necessary temporary structures may be erected, but that where and when possible, in the judgment of the President, permanent houses shall be constructed, such houses to be located and constructed in accordance with plans to be approved by the President on suitable sites convenient to, or in the neighborhood of, navy yards, arsenals, coast defenses, ship or naval bases, Government yards, or other plants, such structures to constitute, whenever possible, a part of the permanent plan or system of national defense.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the amendment goes as far as we ought to go in limiting this work. That shows a preference for temporary buildings unless the Government interests would be subserved by permanent ones, and that, I think, is right.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having charge of the bill if we have made any provision for a bureau of housing and transportation?

Mr. SWANSON. I know of none except as the Shipping Board may have organized one.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That would be organized, I take it, under this bill.

Mr. SWANSON. The bill would give the power to effect an organization to carry out its purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Secretary of Labor is not waiting for us to pass a bill in order to establish a bureau.

Mr. SWANSON. I will say, in justice to the Secretary of Labor, that he has been very efficient and capable in this as in other matters during the war.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not questioning that.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator may not have been here when I stated that the President gave him, I understand, \$60,000 out of the appropriation to make this investigation, and he made these reports as to conditions, getting the material which justified him in recommending to Congress the passage of this act.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a letter here with this letterhead:

Office of the Director, Department of Labor, office of the Secretary, Washington, Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, 613 G Street NW.

This is a letter with reference to the matter the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] referred to a moment ago, and I am simply calling attention to it, because I think many Senators may be interested in it. I received telegrams from some vitrified pipe or brick people in my State protesting against putting out specifications of the buildings requiring the use of iron pipe only for sewage purposes connected with the building. It seems to me that the director of this housing bureau, according to the information they had, prepared specifications that would exclude everything except iron pipe. Of course that would give the iron-pipe people an absolute monopoly, and they could fix their prices at about whatever they saw fit in submitting bids to comply with the specifications. These people protested against that. I take it this is the same proposition that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] referred to yesterday, when in his remarks he said:

I ventured to address a letter to the department asking if there could not be a correction of the specifications which should conform to the municipal building codes of the country and admit this material. The head of the department to which we are to commit the task of spending \$60,000,000 had the effrontery in making reply to say to me, "I hope you will ask me to do nothing further in this matter."

I took this matter up with this organization upon the receipt of these telegrams and I suggested that it would be very unwise

to get out specifications confining the sewer connections to one particular class of material; that from the Government's standpoint, as well as otherwise, it would be wise to leave it open and get the bids, and then take whatever was best. I received a letter the heading of which I have just read, and while it is not quite so discourteous as would appear to have been the reply to the Senator from Ohio it is a very peculiar letter, to say the least of it, to come from the head of a bureau of the Government in reply to those who have a right to inquire in reference to these matters. He says:

I have your favor of April 19. The vitrified-pipe interests are certainly on the job.

Then he goes on to say:

I have seen three or four of them, and have had numerous letters from various representatives of the Government, and I believe that I have satisfactorily met the views of the clay-pipe manufacturers in adjusting the standards.

Mr. THOMAS. Who is the author of that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is from Mr. Eidlitz.

Mr. THOMAS. Does it not also appear that the iron-pipe men are on the job?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They got their work in first—that is, they got it done, really. This letter does not give me any information that is definite to show what arrangement we had made, but he says he thinks he has made things satisfactory to these people. He says they are "on the job." He is certain the other people were on the job, and they seemed to have the ear of the director of this bureau the organization of which Congress has not authorized.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment on what my colleague [Mr. JONES of Washington] has said about a letter he received, similar to other letters that I have seen from this new army of officials who have come in as an incident of the war, men who are utterly inexperienced in public matters. The trouble with the letter and the state of mind which makes such letters as that possible is that these men are unable to distinguish properly between public and private business. That is the trouble with them. They are put into an office for the first time, and never having before felt the responsibility of dealing with the people's business they imagine that they can proceed along the same lines and with the same methods that they used in conducting their own private business.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, \$50,000,000 would furnish all the houses that are necessary to house the employees at these war plants. We might just as well tear the mask off this bill and show the motive back of it. This bureau, which has been created in the Department of Labor, a bureau of which Mr. Eidlitz is the head, has been created with the idea of building a whole lot of community centers for industrial workers throughout the country that are not needed in any way, but of course to win the war—

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to ask the Senator his authority for that statement.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. My authority for the statement is men who are connected with Mr. Eidlitz, the plans that are now being prepared, the numerous contractors who are down here, and representatives of the councils of various cities who are looking to—

Mr. SWANSON. Why did not the Senator have those witnesses summoned?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Because I did not know of it when the hearing was held before the committee.

Mr. SWANSON. Then have them brought here.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have just heard of it. Does the Senator deny that that is the motive back of it?

Mr. SWANSON. I deny, as far as anyone appeared before the committee, that there was any such motive behind this bill. Here is a report from 15 or 18 places which was brought before the committee, which the Senator had every opportunity to read, showing where the plant was located and the necessity for housing the employees. I heard nothing about any such wild scheme as that. This matter was investigated by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The Senator is a member of the committee. He voted to report this bill. If he knew of these matters, I wish he had brought the attention of the committee to them. I would have summoned the committee to hear the parties.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I voted to report the bill in order that this appropriation of \$50,000,000 as an emergency might be applied in the proper direction, to build houses at those plants, and \$50,000,000 will more than build the houses needed for the employees at the plants. But I made the reservation that these houses should be built under the direction of the department having direct charge of those industries. The Senator will remember that, and that several other members of the com-



mittee at the same time made the same reservation. We did not believe it should be placed in this bureau with all its idealistic ideas.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator would put it in the hands of the President.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have just found out that the President has created this bureau and the whole policy is now illuminated. It shows what is behind this whole proposition, because I have had delegation after delegation from my State in my office asking me to intercede with this department in order that they might get a contract to erect buildings for these communities. If we are entering on a real estate proposition in this bill, let us know it. Let us hold up the bill and make some inquiry.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, here is a confidential report, and it states everything that is contemplated. He has been given an opportunity to examine it as to plants in his own State and elsewhere. It is confidential; it gives the number of houses needed, the number of people needed, the amount of contracts, and a full statement of the entire purpose. Here is the report submitted to the Senate committee. Does he doubt it? Did he read it?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know as much about the war industries as those papers can tell me. I sat in the Military Committee four months and heard the evidence in regard to the need of housing facilities at these plants. I know they need them, and I am willing to vote for them, but I am not willing to vote for a great socialistic experiment to build a whole lot of houses that are not needed.

Mr. SWANSON. The bill limits it to navy yards, arsenals, and industrial plants engaged in war production. The Senator did not offer any other provision to it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the Senator knows I do not care to have a controversy with him. I only want to accomplish what the bill was intended to accomplish in this instance, and that is to provide the necessary housing facilities, but I want to point out to the Senator that we are going before the people of this country asking them to subscribe to liberty loans, we are taxing them to the utmost limit, and the Senate should be absolutely sure what the policy is behind the bill before they make any extended appropriation of money or create a policy which will cost us millions of dollars in the end and for which we shall have to tax the people or ask them to loan their money. Therefore I feel that we ought to know what is the motive behind this bill, and in view of statements which have come to me and to men in my State and in other States, that this is a policy to build up great community centers for industrial workers, we should be absolutely sure whether that is the policy in the bill or not.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I subscribe in the main to what the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has said. I have met Mr. Eidlitz, the gentleman referred to as the Director of the Building Commission of the Department of Labor. He is a business man of the city of New York. He is held in very high repute, and has had large experience in the construction of buildings in the city of New York. I am certain that he is in no wise involved in any undertaking here of profit to himself. But it is a fact, Mr. President, that in the Building Bureau, organized by the Department of Labor, he has surrounded himself with many of the social uplifters and tenement-house reformers of the country.

I have in my hand an article printed in last Friday's New York Sun which tells of the Shipping Board building a model town costing \$3,000,000 at Camden, N. J. It is said that 907 houses are planned. It is proposed that workers may buy or rent these houses, and it is believed the houses will be ready in three months. Then it goes on and tells in detail what it is proposed to do.

The town will be made as beautiful and as utilitarian as possible. Though it will be incorporated as a part of Camden, it will be known as Haddon Township. The houses, 907 in number, will be brick mostly and detached and laid off in rows. They will cost approximately \$3,070 each.

The city of Camden is ready to spend \$325,000 in building school-houses, fire stations, sewage, and water plants. Extension of Camden trolley lines to Haddon Township will be undertaken by the Emergency Fleet Corporation at a cost of \$125,000.

The town will be made as beautiful and as utilitarian as possible. It will be incorporated as a part of Camden, known as Haddon Township. The city of Camden is ready to spend \$325,000 in building public schools, fire stations, sewage, and water pipes.

Mr. President, this is the second model township the Shipping Board has provided for that I know of—the one at Newport News and this one. I do not seriously object to the building of

model, practical houses for the employees of the Government. My own judgment is that if a subject of this kind could be handled without too much attention being paid to the social side of things or the uplifting idea, perhaps we could construct these centers in the interest of the Government, and incidentally in the interest of the men employed in the Government plants.

I am convinced that the Government can not build frame barracks near navy yards and munition plants and induce men to leave other parts of the country, where they have attractive homes, to work in those plants if they are compelled to live in houses that are not attractive and comfortable. Skilled mechanics who are paid from \$8 to \$10 a day are not going to leave their place of abode in some pleasant city or town to work in Government plants under bad living conditions.

So, for my part, I am willing to erect permanent houses where it is practicable, provided, of course, every safeguard is taken to insure as near as possible the return of the Government money.

But I fear, as the Senator from New Jersey has just expressed it, that this is only a beginning. One of the gentlemen interested in this very work in talking to me recently intimated that this was only the beginning. I do not agree with the Senator from New Jersey that \$50,000,000 will cover this work. I think that perhaps before a year is over we will be asked to contribute much more.

I would even go as far as to give \$50,000,000 more if it should prove to be necessary, but, unless we are very careful, not only will \$50,000,000 be asked, but \$500,000,000 more.

So I am uncertain just what to do to safeguard the situation, because I know houses must be built and I know conditions must be met; but if this could be handled as a purely business proposition, and loans were made by the Government, under proper security, to the owners of munition plants, gun factories, and shipyards placing the responsibility upon them, I am sure better results would be obtained.

I can see no reason, Mr. President, why men who are making vast sums of money from Government work should not undertake some responsibility themselves for housing their own employees; and I am quite certain that if the thing was properly worked out we could dispose of this matter without the Government assuming the entire responsibility. But unless we are careful we are going to enter upon a stupendous scheme here, which in the end will cost the Government hundreds of millions of dollars, and the only result will be, as in the case of Camden and Newport News, the building of beautiful suburban villages all over the country to which the National Treasury will contribute very large amounts.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. KING. In support of what the Senator is saying, I wish to state that I have received at least four letters from different parts of the United States, from individuals who are connected directly or indirectly with munitions and other industries furnishing supplies to the Government, urging me to support measures that will look to the appropriation of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to build splendid houses for all who are engaged in work which conduces to the prosecution of the war. I have not any doubt in the world but what there is a propaganda now about to be inaugurated, if it is not already started, to induce the Government to furnish buildings for the employees of nearly every man who has any contract, directly or indirectly, with the Government.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator is correct. This measure is a departure from the custom of the country. Its only excuse is because we are at war, and I am afraid that some gentlemen outside of Congress interested in uplifting the human race have hit upon this method to work out some scheme of their own. It is a fact, however, that the whole country needs additional housing facilities.

When this bill came up the other day I took the trouble to communicate with the mayors of several of our larger cities. I find that in Boston in the year 1916, \$38,350,000 worth of new buildings were constructed, and in the first three months of this year only \$1,006,000 worth of buildings were constructed. On that basis it would mean that the building operations this year in Boston would be only 15 per cent of the total operations of 1916. In St. Louis, in 1916, the value of the buildings erected was \$12,851,000.

On the basis of the first three months of this year the operations in St. Louis will not exceed \$2,600,000, 20 per cent of those of 1916. In Philadelphia in 1916 the building operations totaled in value \$47,000,000, and for this year they will probably not exceed \$10,000,000. In Chicago in 1916 the building operations

totalled \$112,835,000, and this year they will not exceed \$30,000,000. In the city of New York building operations totalled in 1916 the sum of \$191,000,000, and this year they will not exceed \$40,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New York, who is competent to speak upon these matters, whether that is not due very largely to the tremendous increase in cost and scarcity of material and also of labor?

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from Colorado is correct in the main, Mr. President. The material and labor going into building construction has increased in price about 50 per cent. I have analyzed the figures recently in New York City, when I was home last week, and I find that while the claim has been that the increased cost will be 100 per cent I think it is fair to say that it is somewhere between 40 and 50 per cent.

In connection with the figures I have just given, a careful estimate indicates that the building operations for 1916 in this country, outside of Government construction, were substantially \$1,500,000,000, and that for this year they will not exceed \$300,000,000—a falling off of 75 per cent. My information is that in every large city of the Nation there is a scarcity of housing facilities. In apartment houses, in tenement houses, in dwelling houses, there is 100 per cent occupancy, and while the conditions in New York are not quite so bad as they are in Washington they are very bad, indeed.

So, Mr. President, with that in mind, and realizing just what the Shipping Board has done in the matter of building these villages in the neighborhood of shipping plants, it seems to me that we are going to have, unless we are careful, tremendous building operations by the Government in the near future.

I offered an amendment to the War Finance Corporation bill when it was pending, which, if it had been agreed to, would have permitted, by offering proper security, the insurance companies and the mortgage companies of the country to come to the War Finance Corporation for aid. I said at the time that one of my reasons for offering that amendment was to enable corporations that ordinarily loan money in building operations to get relief if they needed it from the War Finance Corporation. The Senate, however, did not agree with my views in the matter. Therefore we lack relief in that direction.

The Senator from Colorado has referred to the increased cost of building materials. I might add to that, for the Senator's information, that in the city of New York to-day you can not get a building loan for new structures. There is some money to loan for permanent mortgages, but very little in comparison to what was obtainable a short time ago. The money formerly available for building operations is being used for the purchase of liberty bonds or is being held for the payment of the Government taxes due in June.

If I could write this measure or amend it properly, I would have it read that the department of the Government charged with the responsibility of this legislation, instead of itself building houses, should, under proper security, loan to responsible people the money with which to build. In that way we would encourage home building by private concerns; we would take care of the necessities of the country at this time, and, to a large degree, assure to the Nation the return of the investment made by the Government itself.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to ask some member of the committee if it has been determined to spend in the District of Columbia \$10,000,000, which I see is proposed here, for building in this District? I understand a great number of employees are in the Food Administration Department and that a great number are in the Fuel Administration Department. I can not understand why the Food Administration Department should not be located in St. Louis and why the Fuel Administration Department should not be located in Chicago. I think these different departments might as well be located in other cities which are nearer the scene of the activities in the line of their control, where the offices and employees might easily be accommodated without the construction of new buildings. It seems to me that a great many of the other departments that are located here are not necessarily in direct touch with the heads of the departments and do not need to be located in Washington. If that is true, I do not see why they might not be sent to these other cities, where the Government would not be compelled to build houses to take care of the employees. I would like to know if any suggestion has been made to the committee negating the idea that that could be done and demanding that these buildings must necessarily be erected here?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that a very accurate estimate was made as to what the departments expected relative to the increased number of employees in Washington. Each department was asked as to increased work and the number of employees that were ex-

pected and needed. The War Department estimated that it would need from May 1 to July 1, 4,928 additional employees; from July 1 to the 1st of December, 4,195 additional employees. The Labor Department estimated that it would need 80 additional employees from May 1 to July 1, and from July 1 to December 1 it would need 190. The Navy Department estimated that from May 1 to July 1 it would need 634 additional employees and from July 1 to December 31 it would need 740. All of the various departments were asked to furnish estimates, and the estimated total from May 1 to July 1 is 11,182 additional employees, and from July 1 to December 31, 11,598. They have made an estimate for the month of March, and the actual increase in needs exceeds the estimate that was made.

Some of these departments possibly might be decentralized—if I may use that expression—as Mr. Schwab took some of the Shipping Board clerks to Philadelphia.

Mr. KIRBY. Does the Senator's report show what the forces in the Fuel Control Department and the Food Administration are?

Mr. SWANSON. The Fuel Administration expects to have 160 additional clerks from May 1 to July 1, and 240 additional clerks, I think it is, from July 1 to December 31.

Mr. KIRBY. How many have they now? That is what I am trying to ascertain?

Mr. SWANSON. I have not an estimate as to how many they now have.

Mr. KIRBY. It would seem to me that most of these matters might be taken care of by putting employees in other cities, where they could be accommodated without going to the trouble of building houses. They would not be far enough away to cause any inconvenience in the finishing up of the work.

Mr. SWANSON. In addition to that we have the large works in connection with the Navy and the making of our large guns in the gun factory in Washington, and a large increase in that part of the money which is appropriated for the District of Columbia will be used for housing persons who are needed in the Washington Gun Factory or Navy Yard.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Virginia if he has made any inquiry or estimate as to the amount of money which has already been expended by the Government in the District of Columbia in the matter of building houses?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think the Government has spent any money in that way. I do not know whether it would have authority to expend any money unless there was a special appropriation for that purpose, and I am not aware of any such.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, yes; we made an appropriation, I think, of \$2,000,000 last year for the construction of a building on Sixth Street. I think I am not mistaken about that.

Mr. SWANSON. For housing?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I mean buildings of all kinds.

Mr. SWANSON. The only appropriation that has been made in recent years was for the building opposite the Treasury Department, next to the Belasco Theater, which they are now building. As to rentals, that question does not come to our committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. What interests me is, that when I came here last October and drove about the city I was inclined to throw up my hands and say that the work that I had tried to do for 25 years to make Washington the most beautiful city in the world—that was the stereotyped phrase—had been pretty much thrown away. We have constructed shacks—some of them are almost shacks—all over our parks in the District of Columbia. We have ruined our parks; we have ruthlessly cut down trees that have required 75 years to grow; and we are continuing that work. We have now invaded Potomac Park; we have taken East Seaton and West Seaton Parks; we have taken that strip of land known as Henry Park; and we are going on with that kind of work.

Mr. SWANSON. I will say to the Senator that I am not acquainted with the details of it; it did not come from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; it came, I think, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which the Senator is a member, and probably he has as full information as I have in regard to the matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. The appropriation was made by the Appropriations Committee, but what I desire to know is, who determines where these buildings shall be erected? I know enough about the District of Columbia to know that the Government might have gone out a mile or so and acquired land that would not have done injury to the District of Columbia, so far as its beauty is concerned, upon which all of these buildings, or most of them, could have been erected; and if it had been necessary to build structures for movies we might have done that also to accommodate those who are going to occupy those buildings; but it seems that somebody has gone along in the District of



Columbia, absolutely without regard to the beauty of the city, has destroyed the parks and has destroyed the appearance of the city, so far as its beauty is concerned, without any regard to results. That is the way it strikes me.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am very anxious to ask the Senator who authorized this horrible performance?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know; I know that an appropriation was made last year when I was absent on account of illness.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There was not any necessity for it.

Mr. GALLINGER. An appropriation was made of something over \$2,000,000, and I think the site for that building was described—I refer to the building on Sixth Street NW., running back to the Fish Commission Building.

Mr. SMOOT. That cost over \$6,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Utah says it cost over \$6,000,000. Magnificent trees were cut down in that park, the value of which could not be estimated to this District. So the work has gone on. "Woodman, spare that tree" has been forgotten; our great effort to beautify Washington, to have wide streets, beautiful avenues, and lovely parks has been lost sight of absolutely; and I do not know under whose authority it was done, although, of course, the appropriations were made.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. There have been appropriations made for some of these buildings; but I want to say to the Senator that there have been buildings erected and paid for from the fund of \$100,000,000 which we granted to the President.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no question about that.

Mr. SMOOT. There has been expended in one case about \$6,000,000, in another case \$2,000,000, and altogether about \$12,000,000 which the Appropriations Committee have recommended for the erection of these temporary structures. I will ask the Senator from Virginia if that is not correct?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not undertake to give the figures accurately, but substantially that is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. That amount is substantially correct at any rate. Then, I will say to the Senator, I do not know how much has been taken out of the President's fund for the purpose of erecting different buildings.

Mr. GALLINGER. A little while ago I noticed that the House of Representatives had refused to appropriate something over \$4,000,000 for the building on the old Arlington Hotel site.

Mr. SMOOT. The House did not refuse, but the Senate refused to put it in the bill, and the Senator will remember that then immediately the amount necessary was taken out of the President's fund.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator correctly states the fact. The Senate refused to make that appropriation of over \$4,000,000 for the building on the old Arlington site; but those who were constructing that building reached out and got that \$4,000,000, and I presume they made a fair profit on it; I do not know how much. So we are going along.

I am perhaps not more concerned than any other Senator about the District of Columbia, but I was a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia for 22 years; I was chairman of the committee for 10 years; and I gave the best efforts of my life, neglecting interests of my own constituents, to build up the city of Washington along correct lines. We made wonderful progress, so much so that many times it was stated by visitors from foreign nations that we had or were going to have the most beautiful city in the world. But I do not know what is going to happen to Washington unless we stop the process that has been going on here and seems to be continuing at a rapid rate at the present time. If there was any way to stop it, to halt the vandalism, as I am inclined to call it, that is being perpetrated in this city, I should like to see it done; but perhaps it is too late to talk about it now.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he believes there will be a permanent injury by the erection of these temporary buildings on the public lands and parks of Washington?

Mr. GALLINGER. There certainly is a temporary injury, if not a permanent injury, and I do not know why there will not be a permanent injury.

Mr. PHELAN. Of course, we all deplore it. I do not know what authority has been granted, but in conversation with some members of the Fine Arts Commission I learned that they had advised that the buildings be as ugly as possible in order to compel their demolition at the end of the war.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is about the best thing I have known the Fine Arts Commission to do for a good many years.

If they have succeeded in doing that, they have succeeded in doing a good thing.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want the RECORD to carry the statement of my thorough conviction that they have succeeded.

Mr. PHELAN. There is no intention—I wish to make the point—of maintaining those buildings as a permanent adornment to the city. I think we are all of one mind that they should be destroyed at the conclusion of the war.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the buildings that have been erected by authority of Congress are for the most part temporary buildings that may be used for two or three years. They to some extent impair the beauty of the city. They have been authorized by Congress, notwithstanding that fact and with full knowledge of that fact, because they were war-emergency buildings. I am sure Congress does not want even the beauty of Washington to stand in the way of the successful conduct of this war.

There has been no building erected by authority of the Congress that will be any permanent disfigurement to the city; but they were erected where they were urgently needed for emergency war purposes, and I am sure there is not a Member of the Senate who would not approve of every one of them if he was familiar with the facts. They have been authorized deliberately, advisedly, and solely for emergency buildings of a temporary character in most instances.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I will.

Mr. CALDER. If the Senator will permit me, I want heartily to indorse what he has said. I think that we could not have done better, and it is well that the buildings are of a character that makes it plain that they are to be only temporary.

I might say, if the Senator will permit me further, that I went through some of these buildings recently and urged that every precaution should be taken to avoid loss by fire.

Mr. PHELAN. Does the Senator mean loss of life?

Mr. CALDER. I refer especially to damage by fire to the buildings and to the property of the Government, and I am glad to say that some fire apparatus has been installed in those buildings. That was a very wise precaution, because the buildings in the main are constructed of inflammable material; but that could not have been otherwise, as they were designed to be temporary in character and the necessity for speed in their construction was great.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, these buildings have usually been erected at places convenient to the work to be done. Of course, we could have gone outside the limits of the city or we could have gone to remote locations in the city, but those locations would not have answered the urgent necessities of the war conditions. I am sure every precaution, every care has been taken which could be taken consistently with the object in view. There have been, of course, some buildings erected here out of the emergency fund which was placed in the hands of the President, and otherwise, that the committees of Congress did not deal with; but, so far as the Committee on Appropriations has dealt with these matters—and they have dealt with most of them and there has been congressional action—the committee has used every precaution to prevent any injury to the beauty of the city, and in the long run no injury will be done. An urgent war necessity has been met with as little injury to the beauty of the city as was possible.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator says that no buildings of a permanent character have been authorized by Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator is mistaken. I said for the most part they were temporary. Some permanent buildings have been authorized.

Mr. McCUMBER. Has there been any authority from Congress to erect permanent buildings?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know.

Mr. McCUMBER. And if not, where was the authority obtained?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know to what extent the permanent buildings may have been put up. I do know that the building being erected on the old Arlington Hotel site, which is designed to be permanent and very handsome and commodious, has been authorized and paid for out of the emergency fund granted to the President. Four million two hundred thousand dollars have been dedicated to the purchase of that site and for the completion of the building out of the emergency fund granted to the President. Congress did not act in that matter at all. There were measures pending for that purpose, but pending action the President set aside \$4,200,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. Has the Senator any information as to whether the price paid for that building was an exorbitant price?

Mr. MARTIN. My information is that the price is not an exorbitant one. It will be a very fine building, thoroughly fire-proof, with a handsome exterior and an interior conveniently arranged for departmental purposes. I believe the Government will receive a dollar's worth for every dollar it pays out in that transaction. That is the information which I have; indeed, I think that the contractors put at the disposal of the Treasury Department every book and every paper they had showing what money had been expended. The amount may have been a little liberal. I, of course, do not pretend to speak with the utmost detail, but, generally speaking, I believe it was a very carefully made bargain and that the Government will get a dollar's worth for every dollar it pays out.

Mr. McCUMBER. Carefully made, of course, as compared with some of the other expenditures which have been made?

Mr. MARTIN. I think the matter was carefully investigated. I will say that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and some other Government officials talked with me about it when action was contemplated by the Appropriations Committee, but the Appropriations Committee did not act on it, and the purchase price was paid out of the emergency fund voted to the President.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MARTIN. I will.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to know why the Government does not utilize and put up buildings on the ground which was acquired several years ago. As the Senator knows, we acquired several squares east of the District Building and south of Pennsylvania Avenue. I think there are three or four blocks there altogether, but instead of using that property the Government buys other property and puts up buildings, leaving all that property dead and idle.

Mr. MARTIN. The Government has bought very little real estate, and the buildings which it has erected have been erected on its own property. On the property to which the Senator refers on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue there are already valuable buildings, and to some extent those buildings are being used for Government purposes. On investigation it was thought inadvisable at this time to tear down those buildings for the purpose of erecting other buildings when the Government had land on which it could erect the buildings which it needs. I repeat, some of the buildings on the property referred to by the Senator from Minnesota are already being used.

Mr. NELSON. How many squares has the Government there?

Mr. MARTIN. I can not speak with entire accuracy as to the number of squares.

Mr. SMOOT. I think there is only one, extending from Fifteenth Street to Fourteenth Street on the south side of and facing the Avenue.

Mr. NELSON. My impression is that the Government owns four or five squares there.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator from Utah probably knows as to that. The Government owns a good many buildings there, some of which are in use; and it was deemed, after investigation, unwise to tear those buildings down for the purpose of erecting new buildings when the Government had other land on which the buildings might be erected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I thought the Senator had reference to the lots that face Pennsylvania Avenue; and I said that there was one square facing Pennsylvania Avenue. It is true that the Government acquired the property to B Street, embracing three squares between Pennsylvania Avenue and B Street, but there is only one block facing Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. NELSON. That is all facing the Avenue; but the blocks back of Pennsylvania Avenue are covered with a lot of rookeries which might well be torn down.

Mr. SMOOT. And the city would be very much better off without a good many of them, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. They might very well be torn down, and the land utilized for the Government, instead of buying at such an exorbitant figure the old Arlington property.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in relation to the Arlington property, I will say that I was convinced that the Senate should not without some investigation appropriate the amount asked for to purchase that property. After the Senate decided not to make the appropriation several people came to me and told me that the price agreed upon for the property was an outrageous one; that the Government was being held up; and that the price paid was entirely unreasonable. I told them that I did not propose to ask for any investigation unless they would place in my hands affidavits showing what the property cost and wherein the

price was exorbitant and unreasonable; but that, if they would furnish me such affidavits, then, based upon those affidavits, I would introduce a resolution of inquiry providing for an investigation of the matter. I will say that up to this time I have not received those affidavits, and therefore I shall not say anything more about that property at this time, nor will I do anything about it unless I am furnished some affidavits upon which to base a resolution.

Mr. PHELAN. Let me ask the Senator if there was not some kind of a showing made before the House as to the price which should be paid for that property?

Mr. SMOOT. There was a statement made before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate; but that was based upon the number of square feet that would be in the building, the amount of rental that the Government is compelled to pay to-day for each square foot of space, and the interest upon that charge for rent; which, altogether, would bring the amount for the building up to about \$4,000,000; but that figure is based, as I have said, upon the rentals that are being paid to-day in that part of the city. I have not any doubt that \$4,200,000 will more than cover the cost of the building and the ground, too.

Mr. PHELAN. We know the value of the land, as a matter of public information. Has there been any estimate made as to the cost of the building?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; there is an estimate as to the cost of the building.

Mr. PHELAN. Would that, plus the value of the land, aggregate \$4,000,000?

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the way it was figured out, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PHELAN. I am not referring to profits, but to actual cost.

Mr. SMOOT. It was figured upon the basis of rents to-day in that locality, and what the total of rent would be if the building were used five years only. On that basis it was shown by the Treasury Department—that is, by the architects of the Supervising Architect's Office of that department—that the expenditure of \$4,000,000 for the purchase of that property would be justified.

Mr. PHELAN. I have no information whatever on the subject; I am seeking for information. If the price is exorbitant I should like to know it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have said all I can say about that.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, answering one inquiry of the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], I think the value of the land with the excavation—and the excavation is for two stories below the surface—was placed at a million dollars. I think that was a very fair valuation, because that is one of the finest sites and largest lots in the city of Washington. The Government paid half a million dollars, if I am not mistaken, for the lot adjacent to the Riggs National Bank.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Was the price for the entire Arlington site \$1,000,000?

Mr. MARTIN. One million dollars, including the excavation, a very expensive excavation, going two stories below the surface.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, is it not true that it was foreclosed for a mortgage of about \$400,000 because they could not get a purchaser who would take the mortgage?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, no. The question answers itself. Anybody who knows anything about Washington knows that there never would have been any trouble at any time in the last 20 years in getting more than \$400,000 in five minutes for the Arlington Hotel site.

Mr. McCUMBER. Is it not true that that particular property was sold a few years ago under a mortgage and the title bought by foreclosure of a mortgage or trust deed?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know about that; but I know there has not been a time since I have been in the city of Washington, some twenty-odd years, when it would not have commanded a great deal more than any \$400,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. That does not answer my question. I think it was about \$400,000. I remember reading it at the time.

Mr. MARTIN. There may have been a mortgage of \$400,000, and it may have been sold under that mortgage; but it has never been valued at any such price as that—never.

Mr. McCUMBER. I knew that there had been several attempts to sell it, and all of them had fallen down, and then it was put in the hands of a receiver.

Mr. MARTIN. There never has been any attempt to sell it at \$400,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator will find that my statements are substantially correct if he will look over the records of the last few years.



Mr. MARTIN. It does not need any statement from anybody. I know enough about Washington property to know of my own knowledge that it is worth a great deal more than any \$400,000, and it has been readily salable at a great deal more than that at any time within 20 years. It is one of the most valuable and one of the largest building sites in the city of Washington. I have not undertaken to make any exhaustive inquiry into it, although I have had a good deal said to me about it, and I think the Treasury Department made a careful investigation of the subject. I am satisfied, so far as my own personal opinion is concerned, that the Government got full value when it paid \$4,200,000 for the property—that is, for the lot and for the building that is to be put on it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I had no purpose, in what I said, of criticizing the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member.

Mr. MARTIN. If the Senator will excuse me, I understand that the Committee on Appropriations never acted upon it. I am not speaking for the committee. The Committee on Appropriations never took any action on the Arlington Hotel site.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand so; but I meant in a general way in the observations I made about the city of Washington.

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, I was sure of that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know that the Senator from Virginia is very careful in scanning the appropriations, and I know that the Senator from Virginia agrees with me that we ought to be as economical as possible in spending the people's money; but I will venture to say that I wish the Senator from Virginia had had the same power that he has over the appropriations to have determined how many clerks were needed in the city of Washington because of the war. I believe that more than twice the number that are necessary have been brought here. That is my individual belief; and yet they propose to bring thousands and thousands more here. They are tumbling over each other—clerks who, to a large extent, are incompetent, without any ability at all to do good work. I have knowledge of that myself in a great many instances, and I think we have been compelled to construct a great many more buildings than would have been necessary had there been some system in the hands of competent men under which we could have ascertained definitely how much clerical help and other help was needed in the work consequent upon the war. That, however, is a mere opinion of mine, and it goes for what it is worth.

I think the habit is that when the head of a department or the head of a bureau or the head of a division says: "I want 50 clerks" or "I want 100 clerks," they are forthcoming from some quarter or other. Why, I read a little while ago, and I think it was not a misrepresentation, that a gentleman in one of the departments said that he could use 1,200 stenographers if he could get them. He said it was impossible to get them, but he could make use of 1,200 stenographers if he could get them; and I presume they raked the country over and got all they could. I really feel, laying aside the question of appropriations for the construction of buildings, that there has been a wanton recklessness in the matter of adding to the force of clerks and other officials in the departments consequent upon the war.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if the 1,200 stenographers were needed by the Aviation Section?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know. I think perhaps they were as much needed there as they were in some other departments of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. If so, that might account for some of the \$640,000,000 that we have appropriated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 9, after the word "Provided," it is proposed to strike out the word "further."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, now that we have adopted the first proviso, the word "further" ought to remain in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment will be rejected.

The SECRETARY. On lines 14 and 15, page 2, after the word "exercised," it is proposed to strike out the words "in the housing of Government employees," so as to read:

*Provided further, That the powers herein authorized shall not be exercised in the District of Columbia except upon detailed estimates and appropriations for such purpose.*

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether he thinks that is a wise proviso?

Mr. SWANSON. With regard to the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes. I heartily indorse the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] a while ago with reference to the conditions here in the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that we have housing necessities here that are about as urgent as those anywhere in the country, if not more so, and that expeditious work should be done to secure housing facilities for the employees here. It seems to me that this proviso would result in very great delay. I want to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what he thinks about it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this provision was not included in the bill as reported by the committee to the House. This provision, as I understand, was put in the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives on motion of the Representative from Kentucky who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Under this provision the bill is not operative in the District of Columbia until estimates are made and until Congress authorizes specific appropriations. It will evidently result in a great deal of delay.

In discussing it with the committee and also with other Members of the Senate a great many Members of the Senate had an idea that they did not know what would occur in the District. People were apprehensive of their houses being seized, and it was feared that there might be a reckless expenditure of money. In order to get the bill reported and through, and to save a great deal of time, it was thought better not to interfere with that. I have an idea that this provision will result in great delay; but as Congress is in session here, and the people that are to administer the law are near Congress and can fix up these detailed statements quickly, and report to the Committee on Appropriations, and they can act hurriedly, we thought possibly it might be well to retain that provision for the District of Columbia. Of course, in the case of buildings outside of the District of Columbia, to come to Washington and lay detailed estimates for appropriations before Congress would be absolutely destructive of the purposes sought to be accomplished by the bill.

I think if Congress were willing to leave it to these people to contract, in view of the fact that the President is authorized to expend \$10,000,000 in the District of Columbia, we would get the buildings a great deal quicker. It is for Congress to determine whether they want it operative here or whether they want to wait until Congress makes the appropriation before it becomes operative. Under the rules the Appropriations Committee can not report an appropriation for a building unless it is authorized by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We can not appropriate; we can only authorize; and this authorization was made in pursuance of the rules of the Senate and the House.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; but the committee could have eliminated that proviso and allowed the work to go on here just the same as in other sections of the country.

Mr. SWANSON. I am willing to leave it to the President to spend this \$10,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am, too; but I think that proviso ought to be stricken out. I offer that amendment, Mr. President—to strike out that proviso.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington should be adopted, because the proviso as it now stands would make inoperative that part of section 8 which appropriates \$10,000,000 for District of Columbia purposes, and, moreover, would, as the Senator having charge of the bill admits, very seriously retard the operation of the bill, which is supposed to be one of great emergency. Indeed, the Senator having charge of the bill has on several occasions insisted that we should enact this measure into legislation as soon as possible, because it is one of the most emergent bills before the Congress.

Now, let us look at the proviso for a moment:

*Provided further, That the powers herein authorized shall not be exercised in the housing of Government employees in the District of Columbia except upon detailed estimates and appropriations for such purpose.*

Let me say in passing that the House evidently sought to limit "the powers herein authorized" to the housing of Government employees, leaving the remainder of the bill as active in the District of Columbia as beyond its boundaries. But with the elimination of the words "in the housing of Government employees," none of the powers authorized by this bill can be exercised in the District of Columbia at all until detailed estimates and appropriations for such purpose both occur.

The bill makes an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for District of Columbia purposes. This proviso renders that appropriation practically of no effect, because the powers are not to be exer-

cised except upon detailed estimates and appropriations upon those detailed estimates.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator feel that that was deemed necessary because the committee, or those who were responsible for that particular feature of the bill, were not quite satisfied of the necessity of erecting buildings within the District of Columbia? I will say, speaking for myself, that I do not think there is any necessity, and I would very much prefer to leave the bill as it is rather than to strike out the provision, as suggested by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, Mr. President, if there is no necessity for the erection of houses here, I can very readily understand why the proviso was inserted; but if I am any judge of housing conditions, there is a greater need for the building of houses in the District of Columbia than anywhere else in the United States. This is the most congested community in the United States, as I had occasion to say in the discussion of a previous amendment.

Why, Mr. President, I do not know how others in this body are situated with regard to housing possibilities, but I am unable to lease anything myself at the present time for the ensuing winter. I can find nothing that is vacant, and my landlord has absolutely declined to extend my present lease under any conditions. I assume that he is going to cut up the house into rooms, furnish them, and then rent them for \$100 a month apiece. I do not know, but I know that is being done very largely in this city. I know of two apartment houses the tenants now occupying which are expected to get out as soon as their leases expire, and then the houses are going to be practically reconstructed, the apartments are going to be thrown into rooms, and those rooms which are now used for culinary purposes in connection with the apartments are going to be turped into bedrooms, then they are going to be furnished, and the proposition, as I understand it, is to rent the rooms at a per diem rate, bringing in a revenue which in some instances will perhaps—I hope, at least—exhaust cupidity.

Mr. President, we have in the city of Washington an enormous congestion. It is here, and its limitations have not been reached. "They are coming, Father Abraham," several hundred thousand strong. They are coming from all the points of the compass. There is not a Member of Congress who is not besieged with applications for official positions in the city of Washington, and there is not a man or a woman writing for these positions who does not believe that his or her Senator or Member of Congress has the positions, and can dole them out at will, if application is made in due season. We have been advised that some twelve or fifteen hundred additional employees are coming. They must have them—I do not know why, but they must have them—and, of course, the floating population of the city, as far as I am able to judge, is also increasing.

A hotel was opened down here about two weeks ago. It is only partly completed internally, and yet every room that is available was instantly taken, and taken at the landlord's prices.

Mr. President, if our population is to increase very materially—as is doubtless the case—this is the place of all places where the power to take houses ought to be exercised, and where the building of houses should begin just as soon as possible. Hence to exempt the District of Columbia from the operation of this bill until estimates and appropriations for that purpose shall have been made is to defeat its operation in the very place where it is most needed.

I think, therefore, that this proviso should be eliminated, and I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The entire proviso is out, now, down to the word "purpose," in line 17, page 4. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the words "local transportation" and the comma after the word "transportation."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what sort of buildings it is proposed to construct in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SWANSON. The details are not as accurate here as elsewhere, although they have made a survey; but the matter is under Capt. Potter, and they expect to put up, I think, some temporary buildings, possibly hotels and apartment houses,

adapted as well as possible to the situation. I have not seen any detailed statement as to the kind or character of buildings that they propose to put up in Washington.

Mr. CALDER. I had hoped, Mr. President, that in utilizing this money we might construct here buildings something like the Young Women's Christian Association dormitories, where a number of rooms could be contained in one building, and where decent living conditions might exist.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know, but I do not understand that they have gotten any detailed statement as to what they expect to construct in Washington.

Mr. CALDER. I should oppose very strongly the building of frame barracks, where there might be great risk of loss of life by fire. I would have buildings constructed that would comply with all the building regulations, and that would be attractive, and would be permanent, and where moderate rents could be had in the future.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CALDER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. If that policy were carried out, the Senator must know that \$50,000,000 would be just a fleabite in comparison to what would be ultimately expended. In other words, if that policy is to be carried out, we had better make it \$500,000,000.

Mr. CALDER. I would not dream of doing that, Mr. President, in the District of Columbia. We have a city here that undoubtedly will need permanent structures, and we ought to have something attractive about it, something worth while. I hope some such method will be pursued here, at any rate.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee is on page 5, line 11—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in line 22, of page 4, the words "local transportation" were stricken out a moment ago. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Virginia whether it was not intended to strike out also the words "and other community facilities"?

Mr. SWANSON. Wherever the words "local transportation and other community facilities" appear in the bill they should be eliminated. I hope the Secretary will make those amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. That was not done a moment ago.

The SECRETARY. On line 22, page 4, it is proposed to strike out the words "and other community facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "local transportation, and other community facilities."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the bill as reported by the committee only strikes out the words "local transportation." Was the omission of the other words an oversight?

Mr. SWANSON. It was an oversight in the print.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am not going to object to that, but I want to say that my study of this question of the need of housing shows that it is largely a transportation question. It is more largely a transportation question than it is a housing question. The difficulty about taking care of workers in the various Government works of the country is that they are obliged to live so far away from the works. If the Government had the power to command control of the transportation facilities they would have to build far fewer houses. If you could control the transportation facilities, you would solve the housing proposition in nine cases out of ten; and I think myself it is a mistake to strike that out of the bill. You would save a great deal of money by retaining it. You would not have to buy the transportation lines, but you could regulate and control and perhaps increase the transportation facilities to some extent, and people could live some distance away, 2 or 3 miles away from where they had to work, if they could come in in 15 or 20 minutes by means of properly regulated transportation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that, I suppose, would mean that the Government could go into the building of electric car lines.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I would not say they would have to build them. I will say to the Senator that I am quite sure that existing facilities would in a good many instances serve the purpose; but the trouble is that they do not cooperate. There is a disposition not to meet the needs by putting on proper schedules, and perhaps adding some cars.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is wrong about that. The Public Utilities Commission and the expert who is now trying to handle the street-car facilities in the District of Columbia have exhausted all their skill and energy to better the present congestion. A man almost takes his life in his hands to go on these street cars now.



Mr. FLETCHER. I do not doubt that in the least. I think in the District of Columbia that is quite true; but there are places in the country, not here in the District, where there are transportation facilities now, but they are not properly utilized, and by improving them a little the housing question could be very largely settled.

Mr. GALLINGER. Perhaps, too, the Senator from Florida has overlooked the fact that the people who are coming here not only mildly but vehemently protest against going into rural communities. They propose to live in Washington, near the theaters and the "movies" and that sort of thing.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, I do not think the Government ought to accommodate those people. I do not believe we have any business to go to work building houses here in Washington to take care of people who want to frolic.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. The Senator is more familiar with conditions here than I am. Is it not a fact, in his judgment, that unless the local transportation facilities are improved it will be necessary, in order to house all these people, to dispossess the actual residents of Washington of the houses which they now own and occupy? If you are going to house 30,000 people here where they can be accessible to the places where they work, will it not, in the opinion of the Senator from his knowledge of the conditions here, be necessary to dispossess actual residents of the houses which they now have, unless you do improve the local transportation facilities so that they can be taken outside of the present congested centers?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the tendency will be that way very largely.

Mr. FALL. That is the impression I have had on that line.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the Senator will recall, perhaps, that we had some such bill reported from the Committee on Commerce, and that the Senator from Florida refrained from pressing the consideration of that bill because I wished to make some investigation of the subject; and finally, after a complete investigation, I was convinced that the Senator's bill was an emergency one, and it passed; and a bill accomplishing this very purpose for the Shipping Board, under such language as is contained in this bill, has passed both Houses of Congress, and is now on the statute books.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from Florida and I agreed that it was a very important matter, to avoid a large expenditure of money in building, to be able to extend railway facilities so as to accommodate the people otherwise.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is correct about that. That was our conclusion at the time.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 14, after the word "occupied," it is proposed to insert "occupant being given 10 days' notice in which to vacate," so as to read:

immediate possession thereof may be taken to the extent of the interest to be acquired and the same may be occupied, occupant being given 10 days' notice in which to vacate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Virginia that he put the words in italics in parentheses. I think he will see that it reads much more smoothly in that way.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that being done.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to put parentheses around the words in italics.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 7—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, on page 6 I should like to substitute the word "President" for the words "Secretary of Labor," and wherever else they occur in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that that has been done.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. FALL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, before section 7 is reached I wish to offer an amendment to section 6, which I ask the Secretary to state.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, section 5 has not been passed over as yet, and I have an amendment to that section which I wish to offer when the proper time comes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are on section 5 now.

Mr. FALL. I was not recognized, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recognized now.

Mr. FALL. I have an amendment to section 5, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, at the top of the page, it is proposed to amend section 5 by striking out all after the word "authority" in line 3 down to the word "to" in line 4—to strike out the following words: "To care for and rent such property as remains undisposed of and," so that, if amended, it will read:

SEC. 5. That the power and authority granted herein shall cease with the termination of the present war, except the power and authority to conclude and execute contracts for the sale of property made during the war.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, of course the amendment speaks for itself. I very seriously object at this time and through the provisions of a measure which does not provide specific purposes or special appropriations or estimates for the carrying out of its purposes to fastening upon this country as a permanent policy permanent national ownership, control, and renting of houses—in other words, the real estate business.

I realize the great necessity for providing houses now, and of course these houses becoming the property of the Government must be disposed of in some way; but the limitation upon this bill is provided in this section. That limitation itself is removed, in so far as the care and the renting of the houses acquired under the provisions of the bill is concerned.

Mr. President, we have pending before Congress at this time a bill for the improvement of the rivers and harbors, a great national asset of the country, and the improvement of which, in my judgment, is, in proper hands, just as necessary for war purposes as any other we may be confronted with. The total appropriation carried in that bill is something like \$19,000,000—less than \$20,000,000—and every year when the great river and harbor bill comes before the Congress of the United States, in practically every newspaper in the country, weekly and daily, in the great cities from New York to New Mexico, the Congress of the United States is criticized for the pork-barrel appropriations involved in specific appropriations made upon estimates for the different purposes designated, beyond which no authority can go. The same thing is true of the public building bills generally, only one of which I think has been passed here in the last five or six years, so far as my memory serves me, carrying an appropriation of some \$25,000,000 for public buildings all over the United States, each of those estimated for, each to be built under the restrictions provided by Congress itself; and yet, as I said, upon every occasion Congress, in dealing with matters of this kind, even when it may make the specific appropriation and throw around all the safeguards which it is possible to provide to insure the proper expenditure of the taxpayers' money, is invariably criticized and we are called logrollers and accused of dipping into the pork barrel.

We have recently passed a bill with no restrictions, the money to be expended upon no estimates, with no particular provision whatsoever contained in it, with no safeguards of any kind or character thrown around it, by which \$50,000,000 of the people's money is to be expended for housing by the Shipping Board. It was said that it was a war necessity and we adopted it. This bill is claimed now to be a war necessity. It carries an appropriation of \$60,000,000. It carries the authority which has never been vested in any man's hands before in the history of this country. It carries the right to expend the \$60,000,000 without accounting to anyone whomsoever, except that a report shall be made from time to time to the Congress of the United States. It carries with it a provision that the \$60,000,000 can be loaned without responsibility whatsoever, except as placed in this amendment, that it must be upon security of some kind.

Never in the history of the country, Mr. President, under the plea of war necessity or upon any other plea, has there been such legislation proposed and adopted as we have recently adopted in this body.

Mr. President, I am as firmly convinced of what I shall say now as I am that I am addressing the Senate of the United States. I believe, sir, in my heart that there is to-day an insidious, concerted effort being carried on under the plea of war necessity to socialize this Government of ours, to overturn the entire Government of the United States.

I believe that the provision to which I am now speaking and which I am proposing to strike out of this bill is an insidious effort, is a creature of very great intellect, I may say, intended to fasten as a permanent policy upon this Nation Government ownership, not of transportation lines or of public utilities, but that it is the determined effort of certain people in this country to bring about not only State socialism in those lines but actual State socialism to the very extremest degree; in other words, Government ownership of all the properties in

common, not only of the instrumentalities of production, but that the Government itself shall hold the lives and the happiness and the safety of the people at the mercy of a Government employee.

Mr. President, only once before in the history of this hemisphere has there ever been anything like the conditions which will exist, in my judgment, should we perpetuate the legislation which we are now called upon to adopt as a matter of war necessity. If we read back to the history of Peru as it was discovered by the Spaniards in 1500, you will there find that there was a governing class and a working class. They had Government ownership—socialism rampant and magnificently carried out—in Peru, under what is known as the Incas civilization. The Incas were nothing but the officeholders, and the other inhabitants of Peru worked for them and were allowed a portion of the product of their toil.

I say to you, Mr. President, that socialism in a democracy such as ours means the downfall of the democracy, because it means the tyranny of the mob. We have gone to Government ownership of the railroads to-day, and the best I hope to see as a result from the conditions we have created will be possibly a revolution among the people, bringing about private operation rather than Government operation of the railroads. If we continue to operate the railroads under the theory advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is Director General of Railroads, in his speech at El Paso, Tex., a few days since, then we are confronted with this condition, that in every election hereafter, held every two years in the United States, the great issue will be whether a man shall receive 10 hours' pay for 7 hours' work, or a man's wages shall be increased, and the election of Representatives and Senators and of the President of the United States will turn upon those questions. When you involve Government ownership in a democracy, with frequent periods of election, when you involve it as you are now involving it in every piece of legislation which we are adopting, sooner or later this Government of ours and our forefathers is going to be overturned, just so surely as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west.

Now, sir, under the plea of necessity, under the plea that we must save this country in its great crisis, we are asked to adopt this measure providing exactly what I suggested to the Senator from Florida a few moments ago, that if the people who are claimed to be necessary on departmental work are to be housed in Washington it is going to be necessary to deprive an equal number of citizens of Washington of their homes, drive them away from the city, even as suggested by one of the Senators here that the people now in Washington who are not actually engaged in Government work should be invited to quit their homes and go somewhere else.

Mr. President, just look where we are going. I will go just as far as any of you in attempting to do what I can do consistently to win this war and to yield some measure of my convictions to those who are charged with the responsibility of carrying on the war and of conducting the administration at this time. I have voted for measures which I would never have believed I would have presented to me to vote for. I have gone further than many of my colleagues upon this side; I am going to the very utmost limit; but I can not refrain from uttering now my warning to the Senators here in the United States Senate that we are verging upon socialism, and we have gone to it under the plea of war necessity. How are we going to get away from it is another proposition. I believe that we will do it. It may be brought about by bloody revolution in this country of ours to-day such as is soaking the soil of Russia with blood. We all pray not, and I hope not. I never believed that this Government which our forefathers founded would be torn down as other governments have been torn down. I never believed it would meet the fate of all other democracies which traveling their cycles have disappeared from the face of the earth. One of the reasons why I never believed that was the reason assigned by every writer and commentator upon our Constitution, not only upon the theory of the three checks and balances, by a division of power in the Government, but that this Government could be perpetuated because as a supreme check upon the power of centralized government here was the sovereignty of 48 States as they exist now. This bill does away with your State sovereignty. One of the most insidious wounds which has ever been dealt to State sovereignty is being dealt now. Every day you are doing away with State's rights. Senators present here, those who have a few more years to serve than I have, may yet in their service represent simply an imaginary State line corresponding to the county lines in the States themselves.

Mr. President, let us pause for one moment. Let us check this mad rush in which we are engaged. Let us strike out this provision perpetuating forever Government ownership and con-

trol, and the right to rent and handle these houses which we are providing shall now become Government property because of a war necessity. But instead of providing that the effect of this bill shall cease with the expiration of the war it is specifically excepted by the provision in section 5. There is a specific exception continuing the care and rental of these houses for the purposes for which we are now acquiring them.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to ask the Senator if he will not read into the Record the provision to which he alludes?

Mr. FALL. I will:

Sec. 5. That the power and authority granted herein shall cease with the termination of the present war, except the power and authority to care for and rent such property as remains undisposed of and to conclude and execute contracts for the sale of property made during the war—

In perpetuity, Mr. President, and I say to you now, sir, that I have knowledge of the fact that very recently in one or more great cities of this Union it has been openly proclaimed that the true purpose of this bill is simply to provide an opening for Government ownership of housing facilities throughout the United States, and that this request for an appropriation of \$60,000,000 would be followed until the taxpayers provided at least \$750,000,000 for the same purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I want simply to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that when the bill was before the Senate, I think, the last time the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] offered an amendment to section 5, including the words "sell or," so that it would read "sell or rent."

Mr. FALL. I do not understand where that would come in in section 5.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the word "rent," in line 3, section 5, page 6, so that it would confer authority to sell or rent such property.

Mr. FALL. Then that would continue in perpetuity the power to sell or to rent. I can not think that the Senator from Massachusetts intended exactly that.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is referring to my colleague, not to me.

Mr. SMOOT. I refer to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. I do not call attention to it now to dispute any statement the Senator has made or even question it, but I simply call attention to the fact that that is the way the section as amended reads, so that the Senator in making his motion to strike out will take that into consideration.

Mr. FALL. I think any motion would include that, because it is to strike out all after the word "authority," in line 3, down to and including the word "and," in line 4.

Mr. SMOOT. Only the Senate having acted upon it, we would have to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FALL. I do not think it has been acted upon.

Mr. LODGE. We reconsidered every amendment and went over the bill again.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I do not want to be understood for one moment as insinuating by anything I have said that other Senators in this body are not just as alive to the great issues that confront us, not only the war issues but the domestic issues, as I am. However, we are counseling together. We are attempting to frame legislation for the interests of the entire country. We are all equally sincere, undoubtedly, in our efforts in arriving at that end, and if I have spoken warmly upon this subject it is because I feel very deeply upon the subject. I ask the chairman of the committee to join me in calling a halt, because Congress can afterwards deal with the question and provide some method of disposing of the houses, and if then, after proper consideration, it is to be the policy that the National Government should go into the States and acquire private residences in the States and control the labor of a State in perpetuity, as well as in the national city of Washington, for this purpose, let us discuss it frankly and at great length and counsel together and do what is best then, but not hurriedly in a measure of this kind fasten that theory of government upon the statutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask leave to submit an amendment, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. SWANSON obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia a question. How long does he think he will ask the Senate to continue in session to-night?

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to continue it for about 10 minutes longer and get through with this amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am willing to continue it for 10 minutes, but I do not know whether we will finish the amendment in that time.



Mr. SWANSON. In section 5 I should like to insert the words "care for," so that it would read "care for, sell, or rent such property." I should like to have that amendment made before the motion is made to strike out.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the mischief is in the words "care for and rent." That is what creates uses of the Government in perpetuity.

Mr. SWANSON. I will answer that at the proper time. I should like to include the words "care for" before "sell."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Before the word "rent," on page 6, line 3, in the part proposed to be stricken out, insert the words "care for, sell, or," so as to read "and care for, sell, or rent such property."

Mr. SWANSON. I offer that amendment.

Mr. President, I think the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico should not prevail. What would be the effect if that amendment prevailed? You would be compelled to sell the property at any price.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator permit an inquiry at that point?

Mr. SWANSON. I will.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Would the Senator object to inserting language which would provide that the Government should dispose of the property as soon as practicable and as soon as it could be advantageously disposed of after the war?

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Later on, then, I shall propose it.

Mr. SWANSON. If the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico was adopted it would compel all this property to have contracts for sale at the conclusion of the war.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield for a moment? That is not my purpose, and I think he is very much mistaken.

Mr. SWANSON. I say the effect of it is, if you could not rent it, you would be compelled to sell it.

Mr. FALL. Oh, no.

Mr. SWANSON. You could not do anything but execute the conditions made during the war, and that would compel, I understand, a contract sale. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut is entirely satisfactory to me.

I am not in favor of continuing the rental of this property, except so far as it may be necessary for a reasonable length of time in order to get rid of the buildings after the conclusion of the war. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut would obviate any difficulty that might exist in connection with the continuation of the rental of the property.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator is very much mistaken in reference to my amendment requiring a sale of the property, for it would prevent it. The amendment would prevent anything being done with the property after the war until Congress itself, the representatives of the people of the United States, had spoken and said what should be done with it. That is all that I have asked.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken. When you strike out the words "as remains undisposed of and to conclude and execute contracts for the sale of property made during the war," the Government could not do anything with this property; it could not rent it or lease it. All that could be done would be to make and execute such contracts as might be made to dispose of it during the war.

Mr. FALL. The proposition that is contained now in this section is simply that all of the power of the President shall cease with the termination of the present war, except the power and authority to rent such property as remains undisposed of, and so forth. If we strike out the words which I have asked to strike out—"and to conclude and execute contracts for the sale of property made during the war"—if a present contract exists at the termination of the war for the sale of the property, of course it should be executed, and a contract made during the war, a pending contract, for the sale of the property should be executed.

Mr. SWANSON. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. FALL. I was explaining to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if that amendment prevails, at the termination of the war the Government would have to cease renting this property immediately, and no rents could be collected. As I understand the amendment, all that could be done would be to execute contracts for sale. I cheerfully accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut; I am in thorough accord with him; I think that is the right thing to do, to protect the Government and to show that there is no disposition to continue this business indefinitely.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may make a suggestion to the Senator, I am sure the Senator does not desire to establish Government ownership in perpetuity any more than the rest of

us do, and we ought to have some provision drawn on the lines of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico or the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, which would cover that. I should like to suggest to the Senator that we have a reprint of the bill with the amendments already adopted, so that we may see to-morrow just what has been done, and then amendments can be prepared to section 5—the Senator from Connecticut can prepare one and the Senator from New Mexico can prepare one, and they can be printed and be before us for consideration.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. LODGE. I think a reprint of the bill would be very useful, because we have adopted a good many amendments, and there has been some confusion about them.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that; and I am about to move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the Senator does that I should like to suggest two or three verbal amendments, to which, I think, the Senator will agree, and I think it would be desirable to have them made before the bill is reprinted. On page 6, lines 8 and 9, I move to strike out the words "of his department," as we are not now dealing in the bill with the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. SWANSON. That change ought to be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 6, page 6, line 8, after the word "transactions," it is proposed to strike out the words "of his department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 24 I move to strike out after the word "transaction" the words "of the department."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 6, page 6, line 24, after the word "transaction," it is proposed to strike out the words "of the department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 3, on page 7, after the word "transactions," I move to strike out the words "of his department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will venture to suggest to the Senator that at the top of page 7 it would be well to strike out the words "in the existing war," after the words "declaration of peace." That is surplusage, and I move to strike out those words.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to that being done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 6, page 7, line 1, after the word "peace," it is proposed to strike out the words "in the existing war."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now may I call the Senator's attention to the phraseology in line 8, on page 7, and the subsequent amendment reported by the committee. I refer to the words, in line 7, "or under a percentage or cost-plus basis, nor contract for more than," and so forth. There ought to be a period after the word "basis," and the word "nor" should be changed to "No," beginning with a capital "N."

Mr. SWANSON. I think there would be considerable discussion as to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is so palpable that it does not read right that it should be changed.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well; I will offer no objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move, therefore, to insert a period after the word "basis" instead of a comma, and then commence the proposed amendment recommended to be inserted by the committee with the word "No," with a capital "N," instead of the word "nor." That will make it right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask if the order for which I asked has been granted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be reprinted as amended.

Mr. SWANSON. On page 6, in line 3, some words which were in the House bill have been left out, which I ask to have inserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 3, before the word "rent," it is proposed to strike out the word "and" and to insert the words "sell or," so that it will read: "to care for, sell, or rent such property."

Mr. LODGE. That does not remove the difficulty at all.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I think I have an amendment pending. I offer it before I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SWANSON. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is still pending.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I offer as an amendment a proviso to come in at the end of section 6, page 7, a new amendment, which I ask may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has not been disposed of; that amendment is pending.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator may offer his amendment, so that it may be printed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. My amendment is already printed. I understand I am not in order, then, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to present an amendment for printing and to lie on the table, which I intend to propose to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. SWANSON. If any other Senators have amendments to offer, I shall be glad to have them offer them now.

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to offer an amendment, to be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In justice to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. New], the Chair will say that on the statement of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], that he would conclude in about 10 minutes, the Chair said to the Senator from Indiana, if he wanted to introduce an amendment, it might be introduced to-morrow.

Mr. SWANSON. There is no purpose to preclude the introduction of any amendment; that can be done at any time; but it is simply desired to have the amendments printed. My purpose is now to ask that when the Senate concludes its session to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator allow me to offer an amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have drawn the amendment very hastily, simply as a basis for an idea, and I may want to modify it somewhat to-morrow. I should like, however, to have it printed and stated by the Secretary as I have drawn it, so that it will be in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 5, page 6, it is proposed to add the following:

Such property shall be sold as soon after the conclusion of the war as it can be advantageously done.

Mr. SWANSON. I think there is a purpose to have an executive session for a few minutes. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Virginia asks that at not later than 6 o'clock the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to bring to the attention of those Senators present that to-night at 8 o'clock, in the House Office Building, on the third floor, in the majority assembly room, there will be a lecture upon what has been done for wounded soldiers in the line of rehabilitation, and also pictures. All Senators and their friends are invited.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### RECESS.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 1918.*

##### CONSUL.

##### CLASS 8.

Parker W. Buhrman to be a consul of class 8.

##### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William H. Edley to be receiver of public moneys at Lander, Wyo.

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ARIZONA.

Orvil L. Larson, Thatcher.

##### CALIFORNIA.

Mary A. Dempsey, Colusa.

##### COLORADO.

Clinton E. Mason, La Salle.

##### CONNECTICUT.

Walfred C. Carlson, Washington Depot.

##### IDAHO.

Avery G. Constant, Buhl.

Paul Disney, Rupert.

##### MAINE.

Stanwood M. Rose, East Machias.

##### MISSISSIPPI.

Robert B. Cox, Batesville.

Rueben Lafayette Beal, Monticello.

##### MONTANA.

Charles H. Baker, Big Sandy.

##### NEW JERSEY.

Eva H. Ketcham, Belvidere.

##### OKLAHOMA.

William H. Bell, Pryor.

##### OREGON.

Charles M. Crittenden, Hubbard.

##### SOUTH CAROLINA.

Eva L. Fagan, Campobello.

##### TEXAS.

William C. Blake, Jasper.

##### VERMONT.

Herbert H. Beeman, Milton.

##### WEST VIRGINIA.

Mary W. Scott, Gary.

Lon E. Browning, Logan.

Edward E. Reyburn, Virvan.

##### WISCONSIN.

Mattie M. Wilson, Belleville.

Wayne W. Beggs, Cameron.

Ferdinand A. Nierode, Grafton.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*TUESDAY, April 30, 1918.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, move Thou upon our hearts with all Thy quickening power, lest in the crucial test, through which the world is passing, we forget.

Increase and multiply our faith in Thee and the eternal truths Thou hast ordained, that we may be true to our convictions; that right, not might, will prevail; religion, not materialism; civilization, not barbarism; democracy, not autocracy; liberty, not oppression.

Uphold our allies in their brave struggle; increase our Army and Navy, that we may be a potent factor with them in establishing justice, peace, righteousness in all the world; that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as in heaven.

Hear us in the name of the world's great Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, be excused for to-day on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks that his colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] be excused to-day on account of illness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### AMERICAN SEAMEN.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the Record on the subject of American seamen.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks leave to extend his remarks on the subject of American seamen. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



## THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CAPSTICK.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House set aside Sunday, May 19, for addresses on the life, character, and public services of my late colleague, JOHN H. CAPSTICK, late a Representative from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that Sunday, May 19, be set apart for memorial services to his late colleague, Mr. CAPSTICK. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3771. An act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government.

## THE RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of April 26 appear remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. This speech appears in the RECORD of April 29, the same except with some minor corrections. I assume that the gentleman would not be averse to having the first print of the speech go out of the RECORD.

Mr. HEFLIN. The first print should go out. I do not know how it happened, but it has happened twice in succession in the Printing Office that my speeches have not been correctly printed, and the mistakes of the Printing Office have made me appear to say things that I did not say. In the second print of this speech the Government Printing Office inserted an entire page of manuscript which was left out in the first print.

Mr. GILLETTE. How long after the speech was delivered was it printed the first time?

Mr. HEFLIN. It was made on April 5, and I left the city that night to make some speeches in favor of the liberty loan, and did not get back until about the 20th of the month. The speech was not printed until Friday morning.

Mr. GILLETTE. The gentleman waited three weeks, and then had it printed wrong.

Mr. HEFLIN. I corrected the mistake here as soon as I discovered it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Did not the gentleman correct it before it went to the Printing Office the first time?

Mr. HEFLIN. The Printing Office left out an entire page of typewritten manuscript, page 2 of the speech.

Mr. GILLETTE. It is a little extraordinary that these things happen to the gentleman and to no one else.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think so, too. There must be a pro-German in the Government Printing Office. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the first print will go out.

There was no objection.

## REHABILITATION OF DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak not exceeding two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to speak not exceeding two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, there is being held a joint hearing by the Senate Committee on Education and the House Committee on Education on the bill (H. R. 11367) for the rehabilitation of disabled soldiers. To-night at 8 o'clock in the majority room of the House Office Building there will be given a lecture with moving pictures illustrating what has been accomplished by Canada for the purpose of taking care of disabled soldiers. I sincerely trust the Members of the House will be present and that they will bring their wives with them. This is a very important bill, a war measure, and a hearty invitation is extended to each and every Member to be present.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for 30 days, not for the purpose of attending to any business, not on account of sickness, but I want to open my campaign in Georgia for the United States Senate [applause], and I hope that my friends on both sides will be liberal enough to grant this request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for 30 days' leave of absence to run for Senator. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## MINERALS AND METALS FOR WAR PURPOSES.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11259) to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of those ores, metals, and minerals which have formerly been largely imported or of which there is or may be an inadequate supply.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11259, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 17. That the sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until June 30, 1919, for the payment of all expenses of carrying out the provisions of this act, including personal services, traveling, and subsistence expenses, the payment for rent, the purchase of equipment, supplies, postage, printing, publications, and such other articles, both in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem essential.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 18, line 4, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Illinois a question. Does he not think it would be wise to insert in this section 17, in line 11, an amendment that would authorize the payment of the cost of explorations out of the \$500,000 fund appropriated? It is intended to go into the public land of the United States, according to the amendment offered yesterday by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], authorizing explorations into Government lands, and make examination for the existence of these precious minerals. There is no provision in this bill covering that special service which is now put in by the amendment which was inserted authorizing such examinations into the public domain and was not in the original bill. I ask the gentleman if he does not think that ought to be covered and allowed by an amendment now inserted?

Mr. FOSTER. No; and I will tell the gentleman why. There is a fund now appropriated by Congress in the last deficiency appropriation bill, I think, providing for the appropriation of \$150,000 for doing that very work, and it would only add to that, and I do not believe that it is necessary to put it in here.

Mr. ROBBINS. I presume the gentleman refers to the testimony of Dr. Manning, found on page 68 of the hearings, in which he says that the Bureau of Mines has \$150,000 recently given by Congress and an item of \$100,000 more from July 1 last, which will enable that bureau to gather valuable information concerning mineral resources by the use of this \$250,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what the gentleman had reference to.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is that the fund that the gentleman refers to?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is to explore; to find out what we have.

Mr. ROBBINS. I raise the question now because of the amendment inserted by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] permitting the exploration of Government lands, and I want to know whether this fund, to which Dr. Manning refers in his testimony, amounting now to \$250,000, is intended to cover that? If it is, I shall not offer any amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought under that allowance that they could do that work.

Mr. ROBBINS. If they can not do it, then this bill ought to be amended to permit them to do so; but if that covers this situation, I shall not offer the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is no doubt that they can.

Mr. ROBBINS. With that information I shall not offer the amendment I otherwise would offer.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of reaching some definite position I stated early in the consideration of this bill that at the proper time I would offer an amendment reducing the amount of the general appropriation from \$500,000 to \$10,000,000. I notice that the sum of \$500,000 is carried here in excess of the \$50,000,000. In other words, the entire appropriation for the consummation of this measure will be \$50,500,000. On page 33 of the hearings Dr. Smith or Mr. Baruch comments on the fact that there is \$150,000 carried in the deficiency appropriation bill, allowed for extra investigations, which have heretofore not been made by the Department of the Interior, and the prospective allowance of \$100,000 for

the coming year, which in the aggregate would make \$250,000. That supplemented by this allowance of \$500,000, if this bill is passed in the terms which it now carries, would give the Department of the Interior \$750,000 for the purpose of making the investigation and carrying out the administrative policy of this measure. I move to strike out the sum of "\$500,000," in line 4, page 18, and to insert "\$250,000." My purpose is quite apparent. With the \$150,000 already carried in the deficiency appropriation bill, and the \$100,000 to be carried next year, making \$250,000, added to the \$250,000 that I propose, will make the \$500,000 proposed in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I do not care to have any more time on this amendment, but I would like to have a little more time on the amendment reducing the amount in the next section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 4, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, this is only an authorization for an appropriation. When the bill was originally drafted it provided \$1,000,000 for the administration of the law. After the committee had gone through the original bill and had changed the location from an indefinite one, in which the President would appoint some administrator of the bill, it was placed in the hands of the Department of the Interior; it was then thought that with the organization which they had there and which could be utilized, the appropriation could be reduced one-half. It was accordingly cut down from one million to five hundred thousand.

Of course, as the committee understands, this \$500,000 is not an appropriation at this time, but the Appropriations Committee later would take up the matter and determine after hearings, I take it, as they have always done heretofore these propositions and give what is necessary.

I do not know, and of course I can not tell, what it will cost to administer the bill, but from talking with the men who were before us and who would probably have the administration of the bill if it goes into the Department of the Interior, up to July 1, 1919, they would probably require this much money to carry out the provisions of the bill and do the work efficiently. That is the reason we left it. It is only an authorization and does not make an appropriation. For that reason I would rather that it would not be cut down to \$250,000.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have read the hearings carefully. If this bill has a pressing need for adoption, I want to find it. I have not been yet able to find anywhere in the hearings any statement indicating that \$500,000 is necessary or is an advisable amount to be devoted to the administration of the bill.

Mr. FOSTER. When the committee spent two or three days in considering the bill the men connected with the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and the War Mineral Board were before us, and this matter was talked over. It does not appear in the hearings. The original amount that the bill proposed of \$1,000,000, after discussing the matter fully and after the bill had been changed, placing it in the hands of the Interior Department, that amount was cut down to \$500,000. It was their judgment that it would probably require that amount of money. Of course they will make their showing before the Committee on Appropriations as to what ought to be done.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is not proposed under this bill to create another new bureau or a new head of a bureau?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. McKENZIE. It simply extends the bureau in the Interior Department?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt, if it becomes a law and goes into the Interior Department, that it will be administered by the Geological Survey or the Bureau of Mines by those men now in the department.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is not the purpose of the bill to create another new activity?

Mr. FOSTER. No. The men that are employed there now are employed under appropriations for doing other work. Of course, they can not do this work and that work, too, which they are now doing.

Mr. McKENZIE. So they must have additional help?

Mr. FOSTER. They are bound to, in order to administer the law.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. What is the character of this expense to be?

Mr. FOSTER. The employment of men in connection with the guarantee of price of material. They will have to have men to look after that and men, probably, to look after the different producers throughout the United States and to see that the law is not violated.

Mr. GORDON. Would it be part of the administration of the law to grubstake a man to go out and look for minerals?

Mr. FOSTER. Not one penny goes for that purpose.

Mr. GORDON. Five hundred thousand dollars would hire a good many experts.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is right about that, but that is not the intention, and it will not be done. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Scott].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, after line 13, insert the following:

"The maximum salary to be paid under the provisions of this act shall not exceed the rate of \$4,500 per annum for any scientific, technological, or administrative service, and shall not exceed the rate of \$1,800 per annum for any clerical or other subordinate service."

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is in harmony with the present law in reference to the employment of scientific men in the Agricultural Department out of a lump sum and the other departments of the Government that have lump sums out of which they employ people of this character. I will state for the benefit of the committee that I understand those having charge of the bill have no objection to this amendment. Eighteen hundred dollars is also the highest price paid to class 4 employees under the civil service. So this gives the administration the leeway that they are entitled to, and the only limitation is on the top salaries paid to employees.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I do.

Mr. CANNON. Is there any limitation now affecting the \$4,500 men?

Mr. Sisson. None in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. If the scientific people who are interested and have been interested for years under similar appropriations begin to educate young men in colleges to make them competent and put college professors on the salary roll—oh, the gentleman will recollect the scandals there were about that a few years ago—is there any limitation now upon the expenditures of this fund along that line?

Mr. Sisson. Well, I will state there is no limitation in the bill now. That is my purpose in offering this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. But as to the number of people—

Mr. Sisson. As I understand, the practical operation of this bill will be that when the department shall organize it will be necessary then that they come to the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of getting money to carry this law into operation. That being true, in the organization of its affairs I thought it well enough to let the gentlemen in charge of the operations of the bill under the Bureau of Mines know that the same limitations were upon them under this bill that are now on the Secretary of Agriculture in the employment of like services.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman does not seek by his amendment the authorization to limit the number of experts to 20, 40, 100, or 200?

Mr. Sisson. No; I state frankly that I have no idea in the world as to the number it will take. If I knew the number that could reasonably perform the service, I should be very glad to put it in the amendment.

Mr. HAMLIN. When the Appropriations Committee comes to consider the appropriating the money, would that committee go into that phase of it?

Mr. Sisson. That is my judgment about it, and they then would have to demonstrate to the Committee on Appropriations the need for every man that they employ. The only limitation that they would be under here would be the employment of any of these men to get together their preliminary organization, and they could not employ for a year and put on the pay roll any man at more than \$4,500.

Mr. CANNON. I understand.

Mr. Sisson. Of course, it does not mean every man would get \$4,500; and after they present their pay roll to the Committee on Appropriations, their salary roll to that committee, the limitation here would prevent them from entering into any negotiations with anybody for more than \$4,500.

Mr. CANNON. But I understand that the gentleman recollects, if the gentleman will yield further—



Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. That some years ago one of the fiercest contests I ever witnessed in this House under the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations—and I recollect at that time that Mr. Tawney, I believe, was the chairman—was to cut off an abuse that originated in the Department of Agriculture, I believe, in the Forestry Service, where they absolutely were paying the expenses of students in one or more State universities to be educated so that they might be capable in forestry.

Mr. SISSON. And the gentleman will recollect at that time some of the employees were getting enormous salaries.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. And that brought about a limitation on the Agricultural bill, limiting the employment of these technological and scientific men to \$4,500 and the only purpose of this amendment, and the chairman of the committee and those in charge of the bill, as I understand, have no objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection in the world to the gentleman offering the amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This makes an authorization of \$500,000, and it is a very broad one, for the payment of all the expenses of carrying out the provisions of this act, including personal services, traveling and subsistence expenses, the payment of rent, printing publications and such other articles, and so forth. Why, under this it would be lawful to run an advertising campaign, have publications, and such things have been done. I do not want it done as a war measure. Now, again. It says here for rent. Why, the Interior Department has just moved into that magnificent building, the most roomy public building in the United States if not in the world. The Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines are lodged there. Are they going to build some more public buildings? Is that contemplated?

Mr. FOSTER. May I say to my colleague, if he will yield—

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say this, that the Department of the Interior has a new building, went into it the latter part of last year or the first of this. That building is now filled up, and I will say there is also a part of the War Department, as I understand, in that building now.

Mr. CANNON. Which is soon to go out.

Mr. FOSTER. If it does, it will make room, but we do not know whether they will have to have quarters outside or not. They may have to have them, probably will be compelled on account of being filled up.

Mr. CANNON. I trust not. This payment for rent would allow in San Francisco, in Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, or anywhere else the payment of rent, and it is simply wonderful, and I speak of them respectfully, of what the scientists and the alleged scientists—and there are some alleged scientists who are not scientists—how industrious they are to get upon the pay roll, and they want to have things, and many of them want to travel.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, that may be so.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; that is so.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it is all so or not.

Mr. CANNON. I think I will just move, in order to test the sense of the House, to strike out "rent."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report. Does the gentleman withdraw his pro forma amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. On page 18, line 9, after the word "expenses," strike out the words, in lines 9 and 10, "payment for rent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Page 18, line 9, after the word "expenses," strike out "the payment for rent."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word. I hope the committee will not strike this out. This same provision was in the explosive bill, but it was not used. I think we can wisely trust to the Secretary of the Interior in this matter, to the end that if he has not sufficient room down there in the department to place these people who will have to do this work, that he ought to have that right to place them somewhere else, and it will be passed on by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon] on the Appropriations Committee. It might be necessary to rent a building some place, and I am sure we can trust the Secretary. We did it under the explosive bill, and he never paid a cent for rent. So I think the discretion will be wisely placed.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The Federal Vocational Board is operating under a law that carried an annual appropriation of \$200,000, and they thought it included the privilege of rental; but it did not, and for a year nearly the Federal Vocational Board had been compelled to pay it out of their own pockets, because they could not find quarters, up until recently, when the deficiency bill allowed the amount to reimburse them for what they had paid out.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember that.

Mr. FESS. It caused considerable distress, not only individually, but inefficient effort on the part of the board.

Mr. CANNON. Well, if the gentleman will allow me—and I do not care about applying for recognition again—the gentleman knows and I know, and I think every other Member of this House knows, that no man ever lived that could go outside of everything that is being done and that the President is charged with being responsible for, being the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He must pick out people to do the work. No man ever occupied the position of Secretary of the Interior, I do not care how able he was—and what I am going to say is more true now, two or three fold, than ever heretofore—that could get outside of all the details of these various industries. He must trust somebody. Well, whom does he trust? Why, he trusts the Bureau of Mines, he trusts the Geological Survey, and God knows how many more people he does trust. He has to trust somebody. Now, I think it proper to call the gentleman's attention to that fact, because I apprehend that there will be a great many thousands of dollars asked for the payment of rent.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is correct. I do not think there is going to be any great force under this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. That for the purposes of this act the sum of \$50,000,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available as a revolving fund during the time this act is in effect: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purposes described in the preceding section: *Provided further*, That itemized statements covering all purchases and disbursements under this and the preceding section shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives on or before the 25th day of each month after the taking effect of this act, covering the business of the preceding month, and said statements shall be subject to public inspection.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

On page 18, line 15, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: On line 15, page 18, strike out the figures "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 18, line 15, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have carefully studied this bill and the hearings on it and I do not think it has been shown that \$50,000,000 is necessary to effectuate the purposes of it. During the discussion that we have had on the bill by members of the committee I believe that very good reasons have been advanced for the development in this country of an adequate supply of the ores and the metals enumerated in this bill, and that it is probably necessary to do so as a war measure in the manner provided for in this bill. But while I believe that a good case has been made out in that respect I do not believe that the members of the committee have anywhere demonstrated that \$50,000,000 is necessary to effectuate that purpose, but that, on the contrary, much less than that sum will be sufficient to answer the purposes at this time.

If my memory serves me correctly, the expenses of carrying on the war have now reached the enormous total of more than \$1,000,000,000 a month, and I submit that that is a very large amount of money, and is a scale of expenditures which is bound to eventually tax the sufficiency of the resources of a country even as rich as the United States. And while I am sure that Congress and the President and all of the executive departments of the Government will endeavor to keep these enormous expenses from further expanding in every proper way that they can, still I am sure that, in spite of all that can be done, these expenses will continue to grow. They will increase be-

cause our proper war activities will continue to expand as the war progresses. Therefore I think that the responsibility rests upon Congress in the exercise of its constitutional duties to keep down these appropriations wherever it can properly be done and without hindering and obstructing our war preparations in any way whatever. I think that the present measure is one of those cases where some scaling down of the appropriation can properly be done, and that is why I have offered my amendment.

Now, in reading the report of the committee, in reading the testimony of Secretary Lane, in reading the testimony of other gentlemen who have testified in the hearings, I do not see where it has anywhere been demonstrated that \$50,000,000 is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. The fund is a revolving fund. And after the act goes into effect, if it is demonstrated that it is practical, if it is demonstrated that an adequate supply of these metals and ores can be obtained here in the United States, why Congress will still be in session, and if the Secretary of the Interior thinks that more money is necessary to carry on the work, I am sure that Congress will be ready and willing to authorize the appropriation. Congress has been very prompt and willing to vote all the needed appropriations, and I am sure that it will not manifest any contrary disposition in the future; therefore, I think that at this time we ought not to authorize a greater appropriation for this purpose than \$10,000,000. That is why I have offered the amendment. I have no desire whatever to cripple the bill or impair the effectuating of its purpose. My only desire is to keep down appropriations to real necessities in order that the resources of the country may prove adequate to meet the great strain of the war.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two on my own responsibility in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. I stated in general debate here in relation to this matter that I did not know whether they were going to need \$10,000,000, \$25,000,000, \$50,000,000, or \$100,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this law, if it becomes a law.

I can conceive that if the operation should remain normal in a way—that is, that the ore might be mined, these minerals secured, and flow directly to the places of consumption—the Government perhaps would not have to use any of this money. On the other hand I can conceive of a condition that might arise where it will be necessary for the Government to protect its guarantee by the purchase and the storage and the holding and afterwards selling of a large amount of this material; and in that event it would require undoubtedly \$50,000,000 and maybe \$100,000,000. So I say that it is utterly impossible for us to know accurately how much money is going to be needed.

Now, men who are familiar with these things, as much so as men can be—and I refer to the experts in the Bureau of Mines and in the Geological Survey, and geologists throughout the country, men who use and consume these minerals—they have told us that they thought it would be safe to say \$50,000,000 would or might be needed, and I do not know of any better authority than those men upon that proposition.

Now, one thing I would say to my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK], and I know he is perfectly sincere and would not withhold a penny that the Government would need in order to effectuate this law—that this is not an appropriation but is only an authorization. It may be that when the matter comes before the Committee on Appropriations progress will have been made to the extent that a better and more accurate conclusion as to the amount may be reached. I am not wedded to the amount.

This is the view I take of it: If there is any use for the passage of this bill at all, it is because it deals with war necessities, and I think it does, and very vitally so. Then if that be true we ought not to hamper or handicap or embarrass the administration in the execution of this law by withholding from them the necessary amount of money to carry on the operations.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAMLIN. So I say I believe we ought to trust, that we will make no mistake in trusting, the men who are just as patriotic as we are and very much better advised than we are in the question of the amount we ought to authorize. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that there is no authorization for the use of this revolving fund except that contained in section 11. Section 11 provides for the purchase and the storing and the resale of these various mineral necessities, so that it is not for the purpose of purchase, and the \$50,000,000 revolving fund can not be used for the purpose of purchasing supplies for the Government. I noticed in reading the hearings that nearly all of these

men, in referring to the amount necessary being \$50,000,000, continually, as you will see by their testimony, have in mind the fact of the purchases on the part of the Government. Now, the Government is not going to purchase these things, except in this way: Appropriations will be made from the various departments for the purchase. This bill does not provide for the purchase of a dollar's worth of property by the Government. It only authorizes the purchase of these things, for the storing of them, and the reselling of them out of this revolving fund. Now, if that be true, it certainly seems to me that the amount is grossly excessive, and that certainly \$10,000,000 would be ample for the purpose.

Mr. HAMLIN. Section 14, of course, does provide for the purchase of materials.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; but not out of the revolving fund.

Mr. HAMLIN. The bill provides that the Government may guarantee a minimum price. Then, it provides that the Government purchase outright, and it provides for requisitioning and taking over these materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was up last week I stated to the committee that at the proper time I would present an amendment reducing the amount of the appropriation. I had no particular interest or pride in introducing such an amendment, and I am very glad it has been presented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. The argument—that is, the one that seems to present the most force in the minds of the committee in opposition to reducing any appropriation in the bill—is that the Committee on Appropriations will ultimately pass upon such appropriation.

There may be some force in that position, and I was willing to yield to it in regard to the previous section; but I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is bound to be guided and governed by the action of the House in Committee of the Whole. If the Committee of the Whole places the appropriation in this bill at \$50,000,000, the Committee on Appropriations is bound to recognize the action of this House.

Let me call the attention of the committee to another fact. A great many men in this House have at some previous time sat in other legislative bodies. I do not believe that any man who has had that experience has ever seen a bureau or department of government, whether it be State or Nation, which did not expend to the very limit of the appropriation. That is human. It is a fault, but it is a human fault, which seems not to be avoidable.

If this House appropriates \$50,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this bill, you can be sure that every penny of the \$50,000,000 will be expended. If it is necessary to have \$50,000,000 after they get into the operation of this bill, as was very aptly stated by a gentleman on that side of the House, this Congress will be in session and the temper of this House has often been expressed; if it is necessary to make the appropriation, this House will get together, as it did on the naval appropriation bill, and spend \$140,000,000 an hour without a dissenting vote and without an argument. Therefore the committee may have no fear if it can come before this House or the Committee of the Whole and show a case, that this House will not gladly respond; but I think it is folly to place in an appropriation bill an amount of money that, according to the undivided statements of the committee itself, is purely speculative and arbitrary.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], striking out “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000.”

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

Mr. COX. I am offering it as an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox: Line 15, page 18, strike out “\$50,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$25,000,000.”

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, of course I do not know how much money will be needed to administer this bill. I do feel, however, that a \$50,000,000 authorization is an exorbitant amount. I feel that it is far too much, and I indorse every statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT], that while the Committee on Appropriations is not bound by an authorization, yet if this bill becomes a law, authorizing the expenditure of \$50,000,000 to administer it, for some reason, by some excuse, in some way or some manner, somehow those charged with its responsibility will find a way to come before the Appropriations Committee and get the full amount authorized in the bill. I wonder if it is not time this Congress, to some extent at least, should begin to lay its hands upon the purse strings of the Treasury of the United States? This may be an important bill in some respects. In fact, it



may be to some extent a necessity; but I feel assured of this, and I think each one of you feel assured that as this war progresses from year to year, if it can be demonstrated to Congress that \$25,000,000 is not enough to administer this bill, Congress will be willing and anxious to appropriate whatever may be necessary. But the point I desire to make is this, not to put in this bill an authorization of \$50,000,000, because if you do it will be spent whether necessary or not, whether it will yield back to this Government 100 cents on the dollar or not, or whether it will yield back anything, and here is an opportunity to begin to teach somebody in the various bureaus down the Avenue that Congress to some extent is going to lay its hands upon the purse strings of the Treasury, and not yield to the insistent demands of the departments for not alone a million dollars, but millions on top of millions. I am very much afraid this war is going on for some time. We do not know yet how much we have got into it, but if this war goes on for three or four years more, where is the money coming from with which to finance it?

The time will come before long when the people will have invested all of their liquid capital in bonds and but one other source will be left, and that will be taxation. Now, I hope that my amendment will carry. I believe that an authorization of \$25,000,000 is sufficient. I believe it will serve notice upon those charged with the responsibility of administering it that they must use it economically; that this money must not be spent in the building up here in the city of Washington of tremendous bureaus, with hundreds, yes, thousands, of employees here in the city of Washington and elsewhere, with exorbitant salaries, trooping over the country, drawing salaries with their transportation paid.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has offered a substitute at \$25,000,000. Will the vote come upon that first?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, suppose the gentleman's substitute is defeated, what then? Under certain circumstances I would be for his amendment. I think \$25,000,000 is better than \$50,000,000.

Mr. COX. That is what I think.

Mr. CANNON. But why could we not vote on the \$10,000,000 proposition first? I think \$10,000,000 is enough.

Mr. COX. It may be.

Mr. CANNON. If that is voted down, then we could vote on the \$25,000,000 proposition.

Mr. GORDON. Let us vote on the \$10,000,000 proposition first.

Mr. COX. I was afraid the Committee of the Whole would not adopt the \$10,000,000 amendment, feeling that perchance it might be too small a sum, and so out of an abundance of caution I have offered my amendment for \$25,000,000. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says, \$25,000,000 is better than \$50,000,000.

Mr. TOWNER rose and was recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the gentleman from Iowa begins, I wonder if we could agree on time on this section and all amendments thereto? I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hardly think that is enough for all gentlemen who wish to speak.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think the gentleman will save time if he lets the debate proceed.

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw the request for the present.

Mr. TOWNER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he will consider a request for unanimous consent that the vote be taken first on the \$10,000,000 proposition?

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to do that. Frankly, I will say that \$10,000,000 is entirely too small an amount to do anything with. Now, if it comes to \$25,000,000, that is a different proposition.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. CANNON. If the \$25,000,000 proposition is voted down, being a substitute, then we could vote on the \$10,000,000 proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. I should fight the \$10,000,000 proposition very hard.

Mr. CANNON. If that is voted down, I suppose we could vote on \$12,000,000.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the proper way would be to vote on the smallest amount first, and then on the other.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, if this is to be taken out of my time, I decline to yield further.

Mr. CANNON. Not in the gentleman's time—a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. What was the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox]?

The CHAIRMAN. He offered a substitute.

Mr. Sisson. He offered it as a substitute, and then withdrew that and said he offered it as an amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman from Indiana were to withdraw his amendment or substitute, or whatever he cares to call it, and the vote was taken on the Black amendment and defeated, could he not offer it as an amendment to the \$50,000,000 sum?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized for five minutes from this time.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure there is no man on the floor who would not vote for \$50,000,000, or any sum that might be necessary, for the successful prosecution of the war. The only question here is whether in forming this revolving fund, which is for the purpose of purchasing and storing commodities that are named in the bill, \$50,000,000 is not an amount altogether too large. It occurs to me in reading the hearings before the committee that no such amount can possibly be used; that \$50,000,000 is only an invitation to people to go out and use it, draw on it for the purpose of developing wildcat projects, projects not now in existence, and that it will be a temptation for squandering and losing the money. Ten million dollars, and certainly \$25,000,000, will be an abundant fund for the purchase of anything that is necessary to be stored or accumulated for use in this war and then resold. The very idea of a revolving fund implies not only the purchase of commodities but the sale of them. This would mean the purchase of property and the resale of it. I think it is an unwise thing to put into the bill an amount for that purpose as great as \$50,000,000.

I do not think there is any man here that would for a minute believe that it could be used unless it was used for speculative purposes. I have gone somewhat carefully through the various things enumerated in the bill and the testimony in regard to them. There are only two articles that you might say in this bill are imperatively necessary, which we could not produce. Take ferromanganese, the testimony is unequivocal that in a short time we can produce ferromanganese, because it is already in existence. We have an abundance of sulphur and pyrites for the manufacture of sulphuric acid. Not one single dollar is necessary, in my judgment, to secure an abundant supply of pyrites and sulphur for sulphuric acid. We have the most tremendous deposit of sulphur known in the world in Louisiana and Texas. The sulphur of Louisiana is 98 per cent pure, and there is no such deposit anywhere else in the known world. We do not need a single dollar to develop that. All that is necessary is that the price should be sufficient to make development attractive. The power is given so that the Government can do it if it is necessary. So these things do not require nearly that amount of money.

In reading the hearings it is taken into consideration that \$50,000,000 shall be used for the purchase of articles the Government needs, but that is not contemplated by the bill. This is not an appropriation bill. The appropriation will have to be made by the Committee on Appropriations. I want to call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that they heard the statement made by the chairman of the Appropriation Committee, Mr. SHERLEY, on the floor regarding this very bill. He said that if this authorization were made the Appropriations Committee would feel under obligations to follow out the action of the House and make the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss whether this authorization ought to be \$50,000,000, \$25,000,000, or \$10,000,000, but I want to discuss matters incidental to that question. The issue here is, as I understand it, what the authorization should be in dollars and cents. It does seem to me that gentlemen should be able to discuss that without making remarks that necessarily reflect upon high officials of our Government. I do not believe that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] was accurate, or the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] was accurate, or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] was accurate, when they said that inevitably whatever amount is authorized will be spent. I am sure they are right in making the statement that it is likely to be spent. Congress has this responsibility, but I doubt the propriety of gentlemen

who come in here and stand for the integrity of their bills, and vote to appropriate salaries for thousands and thousands and thousands of clerks not authorized by existing law but requested by bureaus, and then denounce the administration of the affairs of this Republic at this particular time for its prodigality, waste, and practical oppression of the people.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman is mistaken in the statement he has just made. The statute fixes the clerks of class 1, class 2, class 3, and class 4, and other officials, so that any number of clerks can be appropriated for so far as a point of order is concerned.

Mr. RUCKER. I recognize the accuracy of the gentleman's remark, but it is left for the Appropriation Committee to determine the number of clerks required and needed in these classes.

Mr. CANNON. The House determines the class, and they can increase or decrease.

Mr. RUCKER. The House may vote down a bill entirely, but gentlemen come here with very large increases in number of clerks, and then in the cloakroom these same gentlemen have sometimes said—not in committee—that the departments are going wild in their demands for clerks and that it ought to be stopped, and I think they are right about that. Yet they bring in their bills and ask the House to vote for so many clerks, and then the same gentlemen complain they can not get through the corridors of these massive buildings in Washington on account of the horde of clerks. I have recently returned from my home State, and I was surprised to hear of the number of people who expected to come to Washington in the very near future in response to examinations held by the Civil Service Commission for places in the various departments. My notion about it is that sometimes unintentionally gentlemen are guilty of making extravagant statements on the floor of this House that are as unpatriotic as statements which have landed other men behind the bars, and I think in this hour of peril, in this abnormal time, when new conditions confront us, conditions never dreamed of by men before, that it is unbecoming—and I am not trying to lecture the House—for gentlemen to stand up here and publish to the world the recklessness with which the Government of the United States is extracting money from the people and expending it with a prodigal hand. If we are spending too much, we ought to stop it, but we ought not to make the appropriation and then denounce the men who expend it for doing the very thing we authorized and invited them to do. As to this matter I can not tell. My judgment is that \$50,000,000 is too high, and I am inclined to think \$10,000,000 is enough and probably as much as ought to be expended.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend particularly the closing words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] when he said that we ought not to make these great big appropriations and afterwards complain because the money is expended. Yet that is what we have been doing right along. Then we complain because the money was paid out, when as a matter of fact we ought to censure ourselves for ever having made the appropriations to begin with, not knowing what the money was going to be expended for. That is the trouble now. We do not know what this money is going to be expended for. Gentlemen on the other side who have the bill in charge do not know what this money is to be expended for. In some respects that is not to be wondered at, because they are starting out a new bureau, and they can not be entirely certain about the methods which will have to be pursued in carrying out the purposes of the bill, but it is very clear to me that we ought not to go any farther in this way than can be avoided. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] was right when he said a moment ago that we would soon arrive at a time when we would wonder where all the money is going to come from. I want to tell the House as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means that we have reached that point now. We are wondering where the money is going to come from, and it ought to give us pause right here and on this bill. How is the liberty loan coming? It is not all subscribed yet. It is not strange that it is not all subscribed, considering the enormous amount that is required. Of course, it will be subscribed. I know that, but there will have to be another loan, and our financial difficulties will increase with each month of the war, and we can not be too careful about making appropriations not absolutely necessary.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. In answer to the question as to the liberty loan, my opinion is that the farmers of this country are going to subscribe more than \$3,000,000,000. All through the country,

blooming as it is with the finest prospect of a crop that the world ever knew, the farmers are subscribing liberally.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; my own State went over the top first of all, and my district went over the top, far beyond it. Every county in my district subscribed from three to four times its allotment. That is very true, but we have got to have an immense amount of money more in another year. We have had an unfortunate experience, a very unfortunate experience, which ought to warn us as to how this matter will result. We appropriated altogether very nearly \$1,000,000,000 for aircraft production? Where has that money gone? Is there any gentleman on this floor who can tell me where it has gone and what has been done with it? Can he explain in any reasonable way what we have to show for it? No one either on this floor or on the floor at the other end of the Capitol can answer that question. We have built only one or two battle planes, and we do not know where the money has gone.

I want it to be understood that I am not now criticizing so much those who expended the money as I am criticizing ourselves for appropriating the money, not knowing what was going to be done with it, and not directing how it should be spent. That is how the trouble came about. It comes right back here to us, and we have to think about it in these times. If we continue in this sort of way we will never be able to finance this war. We must get down to some reasonable basis. If the committee will tell us how much they must have for their immediate requirements we will vote it without a minute's hesitation. If they come in at some future day and say that they have spent so much and tell us how they spent it and that they want more money for another purpose, we will vote it, and it will not take us 10 minutes to do it.

Mr. FESS. Is it not true that coming in without specifying the needs is getting us into an attitude of mind where no matter what they bring in—and they might just as well brought in \$150,000,000 as not—where we feel we must not inquire, because it is in the interest of war. I think that is a very serious situation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is quite correct. If they would ask \$100,000,000 on this bill we would have been just as able to explain it as to explain why it was \$50,000,000.

But, Mr. Chairman, some day we will have to explain why we voted away these great sums without knowing what was going to be done with the money. The excuse will not be accepted that we were told it was for war purposes. The people will say, and say rightly, that we ought to have known how the money was going to be spent or fixed the manner of the expenditure in the bill.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have been trying in the best way I could ever since this session of Congress to get the House to stop, look, and listen, and to utter a word of warning against the wanton and extravagant waste of the financial resources of this country, but as yet it does not seem as if anyone has been able to set a brake. We can not slow down or stop it at all. Now, this war has resolved itself into a question of exhaustion, an exhaustion of men and an exhaustion of money. The question on the western front to-day as it presents itself to the world is, Who has the most men and the greatest number of reserves? That is one side of the war; that is one of the important sides. The other question is, What country or what side involved has the greatest resources to finance this war? And there is where this proposition ought to come home to us. If the allies are going to win this war as the result of having funds with which to finance it, then that necessarily means we must slow down in our expenditures. There is an economical phase of this war situation that does not seem to grip the country at all, and it has not gripped the Congress in any sense whatever. All a man needs to do is to get up here and say we are the richest country in the world, and the appropriation asked for is voted. You can vote \$100,000,000 or a billion dollars simply by some man getting up on the floor and saying, "Oh, we are the richest country in the world," and up goes a billion dollars.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A billion dollars?

Mr. HELM. A billion dollars. Just that kind of broad, naked, unsupported statement. Now, my good friend from Missouri is not altogether correct in the statement he made on this floor. The Congress is not altogether to blame for some of the abuses that he referred to. There are no more enterprising men in the United States Government than the heads of some of these bureaus, and I will extend it to some of the heads of the departments, and I will go this far, that if there is not an awakening soon in some of these departments these expenditures are going to go to such an extent that it will be something in the nature of a scandal. If you have ever had one of these bureau chiefs before your committee he wants the utmost dollar that can



possibly be put through the committee. He is not overburdened with modesty about his request and his demands. It seems to be a kind of a foot race; more particularly a horse race, and a "2-0" race at that, between them. They all want to have the biggest number of employees in their bureau, and they all want them to have the highest salary, and if they can hear of some other clerk in some other bureau that is getting a little bit more than some clerk in their bureau is getting, they want their clerk to get the highest dollar that any other clerk gets. Now, that is not an exaggerated statement, because I have had some experience in a bill which I have been trying as chairman of a committee to prepare. Instead of there being a feeling on the part of these bureau chiefs that they ought to save and spend this money economically the idea seems to be how much they can spend in the individual bureau. I am for this \$10,000,000, and if that is voted down I am going to vote for the \$25,000,000 proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not fix a time to close debate. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have two minutes of that?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will limit his request to this amendment I will have no objection; but it may be that other amendments might be offered to the section.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want any time on this amendment? That is the only thing—if men keep on offering amendment after amendment here, it might take us all day, and I am trying to close up this bill. If the gentleman wants five minutes, I will agree to that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Well, depending upon the result of this vote is whether I shall offer an amendment or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose I save the gentleman five minutes?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman asks that debate on this amendment be limited, I have no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask that debate close on this amendment. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want time on this particular amendment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; on this particular proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that debate on this amendment close in seven minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania to have two minutes and I would like to have five.

Mr. CANNON. On the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. FOSTER. And the gentleman from Texas—the ten million and twenty-five million.

Mr. CANNON. Both or one?

Mr. FOSTER. They are practically one.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COX. If I should obtain unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, would that preclude me from reoffering my amendment in the event the amendment of the gentleman from Texas should be voted down?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment and obtains that consent, it would be as if the amendment was never offered.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that is the very question I wanted to speak upon.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has a right to withdraw it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to vote for the \$10,000,000 amendment, but if the gentleman does not withdraw the \$25,000,000 amendment there may be no opportunity to do it. Is the gentleman going to withdraw the \$25,000,000 amendment?

Mr. COX. For the time being, so as to allow the committee to have a direct vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAMLIN. My parliamentary inquiry is, Did I understand the Chair to hold that if the gentleman from Indiana withdraws his amendment, and the vote being had, and the proposition of the gentleman from Texas should be adopted, that the gentleman then would have the right to offer his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not propound that inquiry.

Mr. COX. I understood that to be that if the proposition of the gentleman from Texas should be voted down, I would have the right to reoffer my amendment. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] making the amount \$25,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAMLIN to the amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks unanimous consent that at the termination of seven minutes debate on the pending amendment shall close. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] one question. At whose suggestion was the amount fixed at \$50,000,000?

Mr. FOSTER. It was fixed by the department, by the men who first drew the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What department? The Treasury?

Mr. FOSTER. It was the war-minerals committee and the Bureau of Mines and men connected with the Geological Survey.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that debate close in seven minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the question of the amount was raised during the earlier discussion, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] said then substantially what he says now, except that it appeared then that this \$50,000,000 was the suggestion of Mr. Baruch, Mr. Hoover, and of the Secretary of the department, Mr. Lane. But, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] very well and very truthfully says, the tendency in all the departments to-day is to reach out for power and more power, money and more money. The question frequently arises here whether Congress ought not to put a stop to it, whether there should not be an exercise of power here indicating that we do not propose to permit bureau or department chiefs to run this race to mulct the Treasury of the United States.

I want to vote for the \$10,000,000 proposition first, because I believe that is enough to experiment with. And that is all we are going to do in this instance. We are going to experiment in prospecting, in the matter of hunting mines and minerals, sending men into the forests and fields, and over arid territory, to find what has already been located by the Geological Survey.

Now, what are we going to do on this proposition? The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] offered a substitute for \$25,000,000, which would have forced a vote on that first, and given us no opportunity to vote for \$10,000,000, but he withdrew it, and instantly the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] renewed it as an amendment to the \$10,000,000 amendment, compelling us again to vote for \$25,000,000 first. The way to treat this thing, if you want to treat it independently, is to vote down the \$25,000,000 amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, and show that you are going to have something to say about this business yourselves as Members of Congress. If you vote it down you will then have an opportunity to vote for the \$10,000,000. I believe the \$10,000,000 is sufficient to start these prospecting experiments, and this sending of men here, there, and yonder to find something new for the department to do. There is no politics in this suggestion. It is a business proposition on which Congress should exercise its own judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania evidently does not understand the bill or does not know what he is talking about. He says that this \$10,000,000 is for an experimentation, for sending men out to explore the forests, and explore hither and thither, in order to locate these minerals. Now, that is not the fact at all. This \$50,000,000 as provided in this bill is for the working capital of this organization. Now, I do not know—nobody else knows—just the amount that it will take. This goes before the Appropriations Committee, and they will look up the subject and determine what amount, as best they can, ought to be appropriated. When the affairs of this organization shall be wound up, when the war closes, every dollar, in all probability, of this money will be returned to the Treasury. There may be a little less or there may be a little more than the original amount. But it is not to be fooled away, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania says. It is simply the working capital of this organization.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman refer to section 12, where you provide going out into territory—

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman does not know the bill and does not know what is wanted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I call the gentleman's attention to section 12.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman does not know just what is in the bill or he would not have made the statement on the floor of the House that this was for the purpose of going out and exploring mines, because the bill expressly provides that none of this money can be used except for the purpose I have mentioned. Now, that is a fact. My good friend from Pennsylvania is usually right, but in this case he is wrong.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I recur to section 12.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman has not read it and does not know.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this appropriation provides storage facilities and purchase of necessities, if it shall become necessary, and to sell them again, so as to make this revolving fund needed here. I do not know what amount will be necessary. Nobody on earth can tell the exact amount that will be necessary. These men placed it at \$50,000,000 when they considered what might happen to be done under this bill. It may happen to be much more. They may come back to Congress and say that \$50,000,000 is not sufficient to carry out the purposes of this act. I realize that Congress does not like to make these large appropriations. And I have done this: When the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] offered his amendment to cut this to \$25,000,000 I had not any serious objection to it, and I do not have now. I think it is all right if we do that, because I believe if it is necessary to secure another appropriation, and they can show they have rightly expended this money, Congress will make the appropriation.

Now, I ask you in all fairness, gentlemen, not to vote for a \$10,000,000 proposition. It is not sufficient money. It is not sufficient to go out and do this work, and I ask you not to do that. I am sincere about it, as sincere as I can be.

I want to impress upon you the importance of carrying out the purposes of this act and securing this material, if it shall be necessary; and if you make it \$25,000,000 and it should be necessary to secure more money, I believe the Committee on Appropriations, with the approval of Congress, would make that appropriation. But I do most earnestly hope, gentlemen, that you will not vote for this amendment. It is not enough. Any man can go over this proposition and see that we could not secure enough of these things to get along with \$10,000,000.

This money is not to be thrown away. It is simply the working capital of this organization, and it will go back to the Treasury again; but there may be times when it will require much more than \$10,000,000, or much more than \$25,000,000, to carry on this work. The money is not to be squandered. If it were, you should hesitate with reference to it. So I hope that this \$10,000,000 will not be voted, but that the one making it \$25,000,000 will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

Mr. CANNON. Is this the \$25,000,000 proposition?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the \$25,000,000 proposition.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 41.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. HAMLIN and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 54, noes 55.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now comes up on the \$10,000,000 proposition.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been exhausted on this paragraph by agreement. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 54, noes 34.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 19. That employment under the provisions of this act shall not exempt any person from military service under the provisions of the selective-draft law approved May 18, 1917.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the subject of ferromanganese, a subject not mentioned in the pending paragraph. I desire to proceed for not more than five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes on the subject of ferromanganese. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as I have read this bill and looked over the report of the hearings and heard the arguments advanced in the debate, especially some of the statements concerning ferromanganese, I was reminded of the debate here in 1913 on the Underwood tariff bill, and of a dialogue I then had with a gentleman, a very distinguished Member of the House from Pennsylvania, now occupying a high position in the executive department of the Government, the Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer. Mr. Palmer was making a speech, he then being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. This dialogue may perhaps reveal to gentlemen the importance of the bill now before us, and the good judgment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] when he declared a few minutes ago that \$10,000,000 would not suffice to accomplish the bill's legitimate purposes. I agreed with the gentleman from Illinois and voted for the \$25,000,000 amendment.

Here is the dialogue with Mr. Palmer:

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Steel Trust make all the ferromanganese it uses? I understand it does.

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

They were proposing a tariff on ferromanganese.

Mr. COOPER. Then the trust would pay no tariff on ferromanganese, but the independent iron manufacturer would.

Mr. PALMER. I have said that.

Mr. COOPER. I did not hear the gentleman say it.

Mr. PALMER. I said exactly that, that there is no ferromanganese made in this country for sale. The steel and iron corporation makes ferromanganese for its own use, and all other producers of steel and iron buy ferromanganese from abroad.

That statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the home of the Steel Trust, may enlighten gentlemen as to the wisdom of enacting the pending bill into law. For if we can not import from other countries because of lack of shipping, then, of course, it becomes of paramount importance that we shall make ferromanganese in this country in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of manufacturers and of the Government, for, as we are informed, the Steel Trust, the vast producer and user of steel and iron, makes its own ferromanganese, and does not sell any of it, and all other producers of steel and iron must import ferromanganese.

Then the dialogue with Mr. Palmer continued:

When the Payne law was written they had ferromanganese at even a higher rate than this.

Mr. COOPER. Then, if the gentleman will permit an interruption—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. If the Steel Trust makes its own ferromanganese and does not import any, and all the other manufacturers, the little fellows, do import it, the Steel Trust will not pay this duty, but the small manufacturers will. Will not that be the situation?

Mr. PALMER. Well, we can not write a law that will make everybody pay a duty at the customhouse.

Mr. COOPER. But we are expected to write a law that will not discriminate in favor of the trust and against the independent producers.

I invite particular attention, Mr. Chairman, to that dialogue, and especially to the statement of Mr. Palmer, that the Steel Trust—by far the greatest in the world—makes its own ferromanganese and sells none, and that the small men have to import it.

Ferromanganese is absolutely necessary in the manufacture of steel. But if shipping is interfered with and imports prevented, it necessarily follows that we should at once do something to help supply ferromanganese, or the materials to make it, for the small man. This argument makes clear why I voted for \$25,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000, which, in my judgment, is an amount altogether insufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. The United States Steel Corporation, I am informed, produces 60 per cent of the steel and iron in the United States. So, according to the gentleman's statement, it makes six-tenths of the ferromanganese. I do not believe it makes that much. That is all I want to say.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will kindly permit me, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that I quoted what Mr. Palmer, a recognized expert, and one of the country's leading Democrats, said in 1913 in open debate on this floor during the consideration of the Underwood tariff bill.

Here are his words:

There is no ferromanganese made in this country for sale. The steel and iron corporation makes ferromanganese for its own use, and all other producers of steel and iron buy ferromanganese from abroad.

By the words "steel and iron corporation" he means what we call the Steel Trust.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will allow me, I will say that, notwithstanding the high admiration I have for the beauty and the intellect of our former colleague, Mr. Palmer, I feel quite sure that he was not very reliably informed when he made that statement while the Underwood tariff bill was being framed here from a free-trade standpoint. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield now?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not the gentleman refresh the recollection of Members as to who the Mr. Palmer is who made this interesting statement? Is that the same Mr. Palmer who was a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A leader of the Democracy of Pennsylvania?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And now the Alien Property Custodian of the United States by appointment of President Wilson?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am glad that, at last, I have convinced the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the identity of this Mr. Palmer. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. That the President shall cause a detailed report to be made to the Congress on the 1st day of January each year of all proceedings had under this act during the year preceding. Such report shall, in addition to other matters, contain an account of all persons appointed or employed, the salary or compensation paid or allowed each, the aggregate amount of the different kinds of property purchased or requisitioned, the use and disposition made of such property, and a statement of all receipts, payments, and expenditures, together with a statement showing the general character and estimated value of all property then on hand and the aggregate amount and character of all claims against the United States growing out of this act.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Sisson: Amend, on page 19, line 8, by striking out, after the word "day," the words "of January each year" and inserting the words "of each regular session."

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to make a detailed explanation of the reason for offering this amendment. Congress meets in December, and all reports of this character are always transmitted on or before the first day of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is right, and I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if I may be granted just a word further on this manganese question, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], entirely unintentionally, gave the House a somewhat wrong impression as to the conditions that prevailed at the time of the passage of the Underwood bill. Under the Payne law there was a tariff of \$2.50 a ton on ferromanganese, but manganese ore was free from duty. Ferromanganese ore came into this country in large quantities and was smelted by the United States Steel Corporation. Consequently it made, through its smelters, nearly all the ferromanganese in the country, and it would not have made any difference with that situation whether the tariff

was on or off. The Steel Corporation would still have done the smelting, because it was the only concern having smelters to carry on that manufacture. Now, unless I misunderstand the purpose of the bill, vast and extensive as are its powers, it is not intended at this time that the United States Government will go into the business of smelting manganese ore, although in one section power is given to take over undeveloped smelters. So the Steel Corporation will still go on making nearly all the ferromanganese that is made in this country unless the Government not only takes the undeveloped smelters, but the developed smelters of the Steel Trust or builds smelters itself and operates them. I do not find any power to do either in the bill. Apparently, these powers were overlooked, or they would have been put in the bill by the bureau chiefs who framed it. In any event, there is nothing in the bill that will tend to relieve the bill from the exactions of the Steel Trust, and if there was it would require no great amount of money as long as the Government does not go into the business itself and only uses the funds for the purpose of stimulating the industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. That words used in this act shall be construed to import the plural or the singular, as the case demands. The word "person" wherever used in this act shall include individuals, partnerships, associations, and corporations. When construing and enforcing the provisions of this act, the act, omission, or failure, of any official, agent, or other person acting for or employed by any partnership, association, or corporation within the scope of his employment or office shall, in every case, also be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such partnership, association, or corporation as well as that of the person.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], I have only this to say: Manufacturers of prominence in my section of the country—and there are some great manufacturers of agricultural implements—complain of the very high prices of steel. They consider some of these prices as exorbitant. Of course, as an inevitable consequence of the high price of steel the farmers pay a correspondingly high price for the implements necessary to cultivate the farms and produce the food for the people and the soldiers. Remembering these facts, and looking through this bill, I have thought that back of it, possibly, was a purpose to devise a means by which certain things absolutely essential to the production of steel and other war necessities should be made more plentiful and available than they are to-day, and thus perhaps help to protect manufacturers and the Government from being held up.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will my friend from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is now imported annually only about \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 worth of manganese and manganese ore, the greater portion of which is taken by the Steel Trust, so that I do not see the necessity of a very great amount of money for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Suppose that as a result of the enactment of this bill into law there should be developed in this country great quantities of manganese, and that out of that ore there should be manufactured great quantities of ferromanganese. Inevitably it would give the smaller men a better chance than they have to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 23. That the provisions of this act shall cease to be in effect after the existing state of war between the United States and Germany shall have terminated, and the fact and date of such termination shall be ascertained and proclaimed by the President, as soon as in his judgment the agencies and activities herein provided for can be reasonably terminated; but the termination of this act shall not affect any act done, or any right or obligation accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil case before the said termination pursuant to this act; but all rights and liabilities under this act arising before its termination shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if the act had not terminated. Any offense committed and all penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred prior to such termination may be prosecuted or punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been terminated.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, line 14, after the number "23," strike out down to and including the word "act," in line 20, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the provisions of this act shall cease to be in effect at the end of six months after the existing state of war between the United States and Germany and between the United States and Austria-Hungary, and the fact and date of such termination shall be ascertained and proclaimed by the President; but the termination of this act shall not affect the exercise of such authority and power herein granted as shall be necessary to speedily wind up the affairs of any enterprise already entered upon or to carry out any guaranty or contract pursuant to the terms thereof, and such termination."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was agreed to as a part of the bill, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana who introduced this amendment, which I understand is accepted by the gentleman from Illinois, whether there is any limitation whatever as to the acts done by the department or any agency thereof during the period of the war?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. A specific limitation upon any contract is contained in the provision that no contracts will be entered into after the termination of the war. There is also a specific provision that there shall be no guaranty for a greater period than two years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow me to state what is in my mind in regard to this amendment and this section? In the war-corporation bill it was provided that all business should terminate in a period of 10 years. That was the substance of the provision. There must be an end of the contract; there must be a limitation somewhere. You propose by your amendment now to have this mining business quit six months after the war rather than immediately after the war, as the section recites. During the pendency of the war, however, contracts may be made for a longer period, unless I am misinformed. I want to find out whether the committee has put a limitation upon the department for such business as originates during the pendency of the war.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will pardon me, section 11 provides that contracts shall not be for a longer term than two years.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I think I have in mind the point of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the business thus created during the war may run on indefinitely unless some limitation is fixed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does not the provision mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] cover that, the provision in section 11?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Here is the provision in section 11, page 10:

That the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, is authorized from time to time to use the funds provided under section 18 to enter into contracts for necessities for periods of not exceeding two years, to purchase, to store, to provide storage facilities for, and to sell necessities at reasonable prices to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President.

There is a specific limitation on contracts for necessities. I presume the gentleman from Pennsylvania has in mind the entering into some sort of agreement where, for instance, they take over an idle plant.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; for in section 2 the President is "authorized to enter into any voluntary arrangement or agreements." Under that he might do anything under the sun.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. There is no specific limitation on the exercise of any of these powers which might extend for a period of time, except the specific provision in section 11. However, I think the provision in the amendment I have offered—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is an after-the-war proposition. The damage may be done during the pendency of the war.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. In the event that the executive department should undertake to carry this on permanently—for instance, in the taking over of an idle mine—all of that could be reached, if there was an abuse of the spirit of the law, by a subsequent Congress which will have the power to repeal or amend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will discuss this matter, I will be satisfied. I do not know whether we can correct it now, in view of the state of mind the House is in, but I want to call attention to it, because I hope that in another body there will be some limitation over and above what appears to be the limit in this bill, so that a department or a bureau can not make contracts during the pendency of the war that will run on forever.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not intend to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. By the very terms of the bill those contracts could only be for the period of the war, because the bill applies only during the period of the war, and, under the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS], for

six months thereafter, except for the purpose of closing up any enterprise which may have been entered on, and except for the purpose of suits arising out of rights acquired during the war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course you are providing now, and that is proper, that no contracts shall be entered into after the war. That stops business from that point of view; but in section 23, the last section of the bill, it is provided, from line 20, that while the business is to cease after the war "the termination of this act shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued" during the pendency of the war. During the pendency of the war you have the right to do anything under the sun, and you may make an arrangement or obligation to run as long as you please. I say there ought to be some limitation as to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee automatically rises under the rule.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11259 and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with a recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. GARLAND. To make a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send it up.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAMLIN. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania opposed to the bill?

Mr. GARLAND. I am for the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there anybody here opposed to the bill who wants to offer a motion to recommit? If so, the Chair will recognize him; if not, he will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARLAND moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Mines and Mining, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following instructions: Strike out, after the word "empowered," in line 18, page 16, the words "to fix the prices of necessities wherever and whenever sold either by producer or dealer."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the motion. It should be "amendment" instead of "instructions."

Mr. CANNON. I hope it may be read again.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARLAND moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Mines and Mining, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out, after the word "empowered," in line 18, page 16, the words "to fix the prices of necessities wherever and whenever sold either by producer or dealer."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND] to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 57.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 156, noes 150, answered "present" 4, not voting 120, as follows:

## YEAS—156.

Anderson	Browning	Clark, Fla.	Dominick
Anthony	Buchanan	Collier	Dowell
Bell	Burroughs	Connally, Tex.	Dunn
Black	Campbell, Kans.	Crisp	Dyer
Brand	Candler, Miss.	Currie, Mich.	Eagle
Bowers	Cannon	Dallinger	Elliott
Brand	Chandler, N. Y.	Darrow	Ellsworth
Britten	Chandler, Okla.	Dempsey	Emerson



Fairfield	Juul	Parker, N. J.	Sweet
Farr	Kearns	Parker, N. Y.	Swift
Fess	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Switzer
Focht	Kinkaid	Platt	Taylor, Ark.
Francis	Knutson	Purnell	Temple
Frear	Kraus	Quin	Thomas
Freeman	La Follette	Ramsayer	Tilson
Fuller, Ill.	Langley	Rayburn	Timberlake
Fuller, Mass.	Larsen	Reed	Towner
Garland	Lehibach	Robbins	Treadway
Garner	Longworth	Rogers	Vare
Garrett, Tenn.	Lufkin	Rose	Venable
Gillett	McFadden	Rowe	Vestal
Glynn	McKenzie	Sanders, Ind.	Vinson
Good	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, N. Y.	Walker
Gould	Magee	Sanford	Walsh
Graham, Ill.	Mansfield	Scott, Mich.	Wasop
Gray, N. J.	Martin	Sears	Watson, Pa.
Green, Iowa	Mason	Sells	Wheeler
Greene, Mass.	Meeker	Sherley	White, Me.
Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Siegel	White, Ohio
Hadley	Miller, Minn.	Sinnott	Williams
Hamilton, Mich.	Miller, Wash.	Sisson	Wilson, Ill.
Hardy	Mondell	Slayden	Wilson, Tex.
Helm	Moore, Pa.	Sloan	Winslow
Hersey	Moore, Ind.	Snell	Wise
Hicks	Morgan	Snyder	Wood, Ind.
Hollingsworth	Mudd	Stephens, Miss.	Woods, Iowa
Hull, Iowa	Osborne	Sterling, Ill.	Woodyard
Hutchinson	Overstreet	Stinson	Young, Tex.
Ireland	Paige	Strong	Zihlman

## NAYS—150

Alexander	Dillon	Keating	Robinson
Ashbrook	Dixon	Kelly, Pa.	Romjue
Aswell	Donovan	Kettner	Ruby
Ayres	Doolittle	Key, Ohio	Rucker
Bankhead	Drane	Kincheloe	Russell
Barkley	Elston	Kitchin	Sabath
Beakes	Esch	Lea, Cal.	Saunders, Va.
Beshlin	Evans	Lee, Ga.	Shackelford
Blackmon	Ferris	Leshner	Shallenberger
Blanton	Fisher	Lever	Sherwood
Booher	Flood	Linthicum	Sims
Borland	Foster	Little	Smith, Idaho
Brodbeck	French	Lobeck	Smith, C. B.
Browne	Gallivan	London	Stafford
Brumbaugh	Gandy	Loneragan	Steagall
Burnett	Gard	Lundeen	Stedman
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett, Tex.	McAndrews	Steenerson
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	McClintic	Stephens, Nebr.
Cantrill	Gordon	McKeown	Stevenson
Caraway	Griest	Mapes	Tague
Carver, Okla.	Griffin	Mays	Talbott
Cary	Hamill	Moon	Taylor, Colo.
Church	Hamlin	Nelson	Tillman
Classon	Harrison, Miss.	Nolan	Van Dyke
Claypool	Harrison, Va.	Oldfield	Volstead
Cleary	Hastings	Oliver, Ala.	Walton
Coady	Hayden	Oliver, N. Y.	Watkins
Connelly, Kans.	Healin	Overmyer	Watson, Va.
Cooper, Wis.	Helvering	Padgett	Weaver
Cox	Hensley	Park	Welling
Dale, N. Y.	Hilliard	Polk	Welty
Davidson	Holland	Pou	Whaley
Davis	Huddleston	Rainey, H. T.	Wilson, La.
Decker	Hull, Tenn.	Rainey, J. W.	Wingo
Delaney	Humphreys	Raker	Wright
Denton	Igoe	Randall	Young, N. Dak.
Dickinson	James	Rankin	
Dill	Johnson, Ky.	Roberts	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Haugen	Nicholls, S. C.	Rodenberg	Rouse
--------	-----------------	-----------	-------

## NOT VOTING—120.

Almon	Eagan	Kahn	Powers
Austin	Edmonds	Kehoe	Pratt
Bacharach	Estopinal	Kelley, Mich.	Price
Baer	Fairchild, B. L.	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale
Barnhart	Fairchild, G. W.	Kiess, Pa.	Ramsey
Butler	Fields	King	Reavis
Caldwell	Flynn	Kreider	Riordan
Campbell, Pa.	Fordney	LaGuardia	Rowland
Carew	Foss	Lazarro	Sanders, La.
Carlin	Gallagher	Littlepage	Schall
Carter, Mass.	Glass	Lunn	Scott, Iowa
Clark, Pa.	Goodwin, N. C.	McArthur	Scott, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Goodall	McCormick	Scully
Cooper, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	McCulloch	Shouse
Copley	Gray, Ala.	McKinley	Slemp
Costello	Gregg	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snail
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLemore	Smith, Mich.
Cramton	Haskell	Madden	Smith, T. F.
Crosser	Hawley	Maher	Snook
Curry, Cal.	Hayes	Mann	Steele
Dale, Vt.	Heaton	Montague	Sterling, Pa.
Denison	Heintz	Morin	Sullivan
Dent	Hood	Mott	Sumners
Dewalt	Houston	Neely	Templeton
Dies	Howard	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Dooling	Husted	Norton	Tinkham
Doremus	Jacoway	Olney	Voigt
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Shaunessy	Waldow
Drukker	Johnson, Wash.	Phelan	Ward
Dupré	Jones	Porter	Webb

So the motion to recommit the bill was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. DALE of Vermont.  
 Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. REAVIS.  
 Mr. BARNHART with Mr. FORDNEY.  
 Mr. FIELDS with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.  
 Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. FOSS.  
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HAUGEN.  
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. ALMON with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.  
 Mr. DENT with Mr. CRAGO.  
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. AUSTIN.  
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. COSTELLO.  
 Mr. CROSSER with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. DIES with Mr. CURRY of California.  
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. BACHARACH.  
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. COPLEY.  
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. DENISON.  
 Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.  
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. CRAMTON.  
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. DRUKKER.  
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. EDMONDS.  
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. GOODALL.  
 Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.  
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. HASKELL.  
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HAYES.  
 Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. HEATON.  
 Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. HAWLEY.  
 Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. HUSTED.  
 Mr. JONES with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.  
 Mr. GREGG with Mr. KAHN.  
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.  
 Mr. LAZARO with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. LUNN with Mr. KING.  
 Mr. MCLEMORE with Mr. MCARTHUR.  
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. MCCULLOCH.  
 Mr. NEELY with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. MORIN.  
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. WARD.  
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.  
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. NORTON.  
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. PORTER.  
 Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. PRATT.  
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. RAMSEY.  
 Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. SLEMP.  
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. SMITH of Michigan.  
 Mr. SNOOK with Mr. TINKHAM.  
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. KREIDER.  
 Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.  
 Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. VOIGT.  
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. WALDOW.  
 Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. REAVIS. I voted "nay," but I wish to change my vote and answer "present."

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay," but I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MADDEN, and I withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I report the bill H. R. 11250 back to the House with instructions to strike out, in line 18, page 16, the words:

To fix the price of necessities, wherever and whenever sold, either by producer or dealer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] reports back the amendment that was offered in the motion to recommit.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.  
 Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the previous question has been ordered under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered.

Mr. FOSTER. I move the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. The previous question is operating.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I think it is operating.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is provided for in the rule. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment contained in the instructions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. GILLETT. Does not the Speaker wish to reconsider that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is right. The question is on the bill as amended.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of passing the bill will, as their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 290, nays 7, answered "present" 4, not voting 129, as follows:

## YEAS—290.

Alexander	Evans	Kinkaid	Russell
Anderson	Fairfield	Kitchin	Sabath
Anthony	Farr	Knutson	Sanders, Ind.
Ashbrook	Ferris	Kraus	Sanders, La.
Aswell	Fess	Langley	Saunders, Va.
Ayres	Fisher	Larsen	Scott, Mich.
Bankhead	Flood	Lee, Cal.	Sells
Barkley	Focht	Lee, Ga.	Shackelford
Beakes	Foster	Leibach	Shallenberger
Bell	Francis	Leshner	Sherley
Beshlin	Frear	Lever	Sherwood
Black	Freeman	Lithicum	Siegel
Blackmon	French	Little	Sinnott
Blanton	Fuller, Ill.	Lobeck	Sisson
Booher	Fuller, Mass.	London	Slayden
Borland	Gallivan	Longworth	Sloan
Bowers	Gandy	Lufkin	Smith, Idaho
Brand	Gard	Lundeen	Smith, C. B.
Britton	Garland	McAndrews	Snell
Brodbeck	Garrett, Tex.	McClintic	Snyder
Browne	Gillett	McFadden	Steagall
Browning	Glynn	McKenzie	Stedman
Brumbaugh	Good	McKeown	Steenerson
Buchanan	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stevenson
Burnett	Gordon	Magee	Strong
Burrage	Gould	Mansfield	Sweet
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Ill.	Mapes	Swift
Byrns, Tenn.	Gray, N. J.	Martin	Switzer
Campbell, Kans.	Green, Iowa	Mason	Tague
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Mays	Talbot
Cantrill	Greene, Vt.	Meeker	Taylor, Ark.
Caraway	Griest	Merritt	Taylor, Colo.
Carter, Okla.	Griffin	Miller, Wash.	Temple
Cary	Hadley	Moon	Tillman
Chandler, Okla.	Hamill	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Church	Hamilton, Mich.	Moores, Ind.	Timberlake
Classon	Hamlin	Morgan	Towner
Claypool	Hardy	Mudd	Treadway
Cleary	Harrison, Miss.	Nelson	Van Dyke
Coady	Harrison, Va.	Nolan	Venable
Collier	Hastings	Oldfield	Vestal
Connally, Tex.	Haugen	Oliver, Ala.	Vinson
Connolly, Kans.	Hayden	Oliver, N. Y.	Voigt
Cooper, Wis.	Heflin	Osborne	Volstead
Cox	Helm	Overmyer	Walker
Crisp	Helvering	Overstreet	Walsh
Currie, Mich.	Hensley	Padgett	Walton
Dale, N. Y.	Hersey	Paige	Wason
Dallinger	Hicks	Park	Watkins
Darrow	Hilliard	Parker, N. J.	Watson, Pa.
Davidson	Holland	Parker, N. Y.	Watson, Va.
Davis	Hollingsworth	Peters	Weaver
Decker	Huddleston	Platt	Webb
Delaney	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Welling
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Pou	Welty
Denton	Humphreys	Purnell	Whaley
Dickinson	Hutchinson	Quin	Wheeler
Dill	Igoe	Rainey, J. W.	White, Me.
Dillon	Ireland	Raker	White, Ohio
Dixon	James	Ramseyer	Williams
Domineck	Johnson, Ky.	Randall	Wilson, Ill.
Donovan	Juul	Rankin	Wilson, La.
Doolittle	Kearns	Reed	Wingo
Doremus	Keating	Robbins	Winslow
Dowell	Kehoe	Roberts	Wise
Drane	Kelley, Mich.	Robinson	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kelly, Pa.	Rodenberg	Woodyard
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa	Rogers	Wright
Eagle	Kettner	Romjue	Young, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Key, Ohio	Rose	Young, Tex.
Elston	Kliss, Pa.	Rowe	Zihlman
Emerson	Kincheloe	Ruby	

## NAYS—7.

Cannon	Garrett, Tenn.	Stafford	Thomas
Elliott	La Follette	Sterling, Ill.	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Clark, Fla.	Nicholls, S. C.	Rouse	Sears
-------------	-----------------	-------	-------

## NOT VOTING—129.

Almon	Crago	Fairchild, B. L.	Heaton
Austin	Cramton	Fairchild, G. W.	Heintz
Bacharach	Crosser	Fields	Hood
Baer	Curry, Cal.	Flynn	Houston
Barnhart	Dale, Vt.	Fordney	Howard
Butler	Denison	Foss	Husted
Caldwell	Dent	Gallagher	Jacoway
Campbell, Pa.	Dewalt	Glass	Johnson, S. Dak.
Carew	Dies	Godwin, N. C.	Johnson, Wash.
Carlin	Dooling	Goodall	Jones
Carter, Mass.	Doughton	Graham, Pa.	Kahn
Chandler, N. Y.	Drukker	Gray, Ala.	Kennedy, R. I.
Clark, Pa.	Dupré	Gregg	King
Cooper, Ohio	Eagan	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kreider
Cooper, W. Va.	Edmonds	Haskell	LaGuardia
Copley	Esch	Hawley	Lazaro
Costello	Estopinal	Hayes	Littlepage

Lunn	Nichols, Mich.	Rucker	Stephens, Nebr.
McArthur	Norton	Sanders, N. Y.	Sterling, Pa.
McCormick	Olney	Sanford	Stiness
McCulloch	O'Shaunessy	Schall	Sullivan
McKinley	Phelan	Scott, Iowa	Summers
McLaughlin, Pa.	Porter	Scott, Pa.	Templeton
McLemore	Powers	Scully	Thompson
Madden	Pratt	Shouse	Tinkham
Maher	Price	Sims	Vare
Mann	Ragsdale	Slemp	Waldow
Miller, Minn.	Rainey, H. T.	Small	Ward
Mondell	Ramsey	Smith, Mich.	Wilson, Tex.
Montague	Rayburn	Smith, T. F.	Woods, Iowa
Morin	Reavis	Snook	
Mott	Riordan	Steele	
Neely	Rowland	Stephens, Miss.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. CRAMTON.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. ALMON with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. LAZARO with Mr. WALDOW.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. DALE of Vermont.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. HEATON.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. SCOTT of Iowa.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. SIMS with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MADDEN. I wish to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. ROUSE, and he answered "Present."

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from West Virginia, Mr. COOPER, is absent. I believe if he were present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these sections may be renumbered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may renumber the sections. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. FOSTER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## AMENDMENT OF THE NATURALIZATION LAWS.

Mr. BURNETT, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, presented for printing, under the rule, the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization.

## INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommend the conference report on the bill H. R. 8696, the Indian appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to recommend to the conferees the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Speaker has examined the precedents and made up his mind that the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is in order, I do not wish to discuss the question. Of course, the motion made by the gentleman from Oklahoma establishes, in a way, a precedent in this House. There are rulings by former Speakers that hold that under conditions similar to the situation presented in this case no motion to recommit is necessary; that the printing of the conference report by the gentleman from Oklahoma in the Record, when this House did not have possession of the papers, was without any authority whatsoever.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Was informal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was irregular and should be disregarded completely. I realize that we are establishing a ruling here that will apply in the future many, many times, not only in this body but in the other body. For instance, a conference report is brought into this House; a point of order is made against it; we have the papers and it is considered. The Speaker sustains the point of order that the conferees exceeded their authority. In the other body no action has been taken on the conference report.



It has not even been presented, because, Mr. Speaker, while it is frequently the practice that conferees present for printing in the RECORD conference reports without the possession of the papers, the conference report has no right to be presented formally for consideration until the conferees are in possession of the papers.

In this case the Senate agreed to the conference and the papers were in the possession of the Senate conferees. When the report was presented to the Senate for action a point of order was made. It is immaterial what was the reason for the Senate recommitting the bill, whether it was in consonance with some rule which was adopted by that body, which provides that no legislation can be added to any amendment by the conferees, or whether it was recommitted on formal vote. If the gentleman from Oklahoma had not presented the conference report for printing in the RECORD, this House would not have been advised whatsoever of the action of the Senate, except informally. The conferees would still be in existence, because they had not presented their report, and they would naturally go back into conference without any action whatever on the part of the House.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is assuming, I think, that the Senate followed out the correct procedure, which it did not do. The situation, Mr. Speaker, is just about this: The Senate has a rule that provides that when a point of order is sustained against a conference report, such report is automatically recommitted to conference. That rule was invoked against this conference report, but when the Senate notified the House of that action, it messaged the papers in connection with the bill along over to the House, and the original papers in connection with the matter are now on the Speaker's desk. I have asked unanimous consent to take them down so that we might get back into conference, but that has been refused by the House, so I know of no way by which the papers can go off the Speaker's desk now except by some action of the House itself. Therefore I have made this motion to bring the matter to the issue of the necessary procedure.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman's unanimous-consent request was to withdraw the conference report which he had previously presented.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The papers were with the conference report. Now, I know of no other way to get at this, Mr. Speaker, so far as the House is concerned. It might be that the Senate could pass a resolution requesting the return of the papers to the Senate, and in that way conform to the procedure as it has been in the past and as it was supposed to be by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I made no request. I moved to recommit the bill to conference.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that one of two things ought to be done, in view of the rules of the Senate. When we remember the condition of affairs at the close of the session, when time is of the utmost importance, we realize what difficulty we would have if this procedure should have to be gone through with and a point of order should be sustained, as it was in this instance in the Senate. Either the rules of the House ought to be amended so that this bill could automatically go back to conference or else the Chair ought to make a ruling that would send the bill automatically back to conference without any motion.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If the Senate had retained possession of the papers, as is the practice when sending a bill back to conference, then the bill would have gone back to conference automatically; but when they sent their message to the House, after the conference report had been recommitted, it seems they made the mistake of sending the papers along with the report, and the papers are now on the Speaker's table, unavailable to the conferees except by permission of the House. The House managers have not been discharged. All precedents hold the conference committee to be still in existence. The committee is not functus officio; it could function if it only had possession of the papers. Now, the only thing necessary to be done to unscramble the eggs and the only thing the conferees or the House should concern itself about is in transferring legal possession of the original papers in the case from the House to the House conferees. Since we have failed to get unanimous consent I know of no way that can be done if such a motion as this is ruled out of order.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, in this connection let me direct the attention of the Chair to one other point. Is there a confer-

ence committee existing on the part of the House pertaining to this Indian bill? If the Chair holds that it is necessary for the House by a motion to send the bill back to conference, is it not further necessary for the Chair to appoint conferees again? And would not the House have the right under the rules to select the conferees if it desired to do so—to change the conferees? The Speaker or even the House would have the right to change the conferees, naming different conferees than those that formerly existed on this bill. So I suggest to the Chair that one of two things ought to be done. Either the rules ought to be amended so that this bill would go back to conference automatically with the same conferees, or else the Speaker ought to hold, in order to facilitate matters, that it does not go back automatically to those same conferees, because we would naturally have to select new conferees if the Chair held that it was necessary to send it back to conference. If there is no conference, there are no conferees, and therefore in sending it back to conference the Chair would have to reappoint the conferees.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. Mr. WALSH. The gentleman does not contend that we ought to permit another body to make rules for us, does he?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, no; but I do contend, Mr. Speaker, that our rules ought to contain whatever is necessary to facilitate the action of this House in connection with the action of another body.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, so far as I have been able to determine from precedents, the Senate was clearly within its right when it recommitted this conference report. It has been ruled time and again that either House has a right to recommit a conference report, provided either House has not taken such action as would discharge its conferees. That was ruled once in a controversy over this very same bill.

In the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress the Senate recommitted the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, and the point of order made against that motion was overruled by the Vice President. The House procedure in that case, to a certain point, was somewhat similar to this. The House seemed to have filed its conference report informally before the Senate took the action of recommitting. After the Senate recommitted, the conferees went back into session, taking up the Senate amendments de novo. When the report had been completed, one of the House managers presented the report for printing under the rules. The point of order was made that a report had already been filed and not disposed of. The Chair overruled the point of order on the ground that the filing of the report by the House conferees did not contain the original papers and was therefore informal.

The difference between that case and this seems to be only this: When the Senate messaged their action to the House on the former case the papers did not accompany the message, and the Chair seems to have held on that occasion that the bill went back to conference automatically. Undoubtedly that would apply to this situation but for the fact that when the Senate messaged this action of recommitment over to the House this time it sent along with the message the original papers in the case, thereby placing them on the Speaker's desk.

What action has been taken in the House to discharge its conferees? No action whatever has been taken by the House except the mere informal filing of the report for printing. The filing of the report, even if formal and accompanied by the papers, is not a disposal of the report. It does not even constitute consideration of the report, so there can be no doubt about the present existence of the conference committee so far as the House conferees are concerned.

Mr. GARNER. If the conferees exist now, why is it necessary for the House to take any action at all?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. On account of the mistake made by the Senate in messaging the original papers from the Senate to the House, the papers being on the Speaker's desk and the conferees being unable to get them without some action by the House.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GILLETT. But if the same point of order had been made in the House as was made in the Senate—and, of course, it might have been—that would have amounted here to a rejection of the conference report, would it not?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; that would have been the effect.

Mr. GILLETT. Ought we to allow the conference report to be rejected here by a point of order, while in the Senate the conference report is sent back to the conferees by a point of order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. When there are none in existence?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. But the conferees are in existence now.

Mr. GILLET. But if anybody should make the point of order here against that conference report it would have to be sustained, and this conference report would be rejected, and therefore there would not be any conferees.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; but the Senate rules differ from the rules of the House in that respect. The Senate rule provides that the sustaining of a point of order against a conference report automatically recommits the measure to conference.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But to whom?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. You can move to recommit the conference report in the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To whom?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. To the conference committee, provided the conferees have not been discharged.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Provided there is a conference committee in existence.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; provided the conferees are in existence, it is competent to move to recommit the conference report in the House or in the Senate.

Mr. GILLET. But we do not want this question to come up on every conference report.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GILLET. It seems to me we had better settle it one way or the other.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I want to settle it now, and that is the purpose of my motion.

Mr. GILLET. But it does not seem to me this is a good way to settle it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, of course the Senate rules can not operate further than upon the Members of its own body or upon its own agents, or functionaries. But the mere fact that the Senate has made a rule which operates of its own force to have the effect of a recommitment is no reason why the House should raise a controversy with that body over that particular rule, so long as it does not operate to our prejudice, or disadvantage. The fact that the rules of the Senate provide that a ruling sustaining a point of order to a conference report shall have the same effect as a motion recommitting the report is nothing that concerns us. Of course it would be competent under the rules of the Senate to make a formal motion to recommit a report to the conferees, so long as there was a joint conference committee to which that report could be recommitment. The sole question that interests us is, whether there is such a conference committee. That inquiry can be answered by an appeal to our own procedure, and our own records.

Has this House taken any action which has operated to discharge our members of the conference committee? If so, what is it? As I understand, from the facts stated by the gentleman from Oklahoma the action that has been taken is by no means sufficient to effect such a discharge. It seems that as a result of some informality, the papers are here, when as a matter of fact, they should be in the Senate. That being so the gentleman from Oklahoma asks that these papers be remitted to the conference committee which is still in existence, inasmuch as no action in either body has operated to discharge it. If it is contended that the conference committee of the House has been discharged by any action that we have taken, then I ask again what is that action? That is the one inquiry to which we should direct our attention. Of course I repudiate any suggestion that the Senate by the operation of its own rules can control our procedure, or the joint procedure, or in any way impinge on the rights of the House. I would resent any effort to that end by the Senate in the most emphatic manner. But it is certainly competent for the Senate to recommit a report to a conference committee still in being. No objection to that action on their part could be raised in this body. It seems to me the report heretofore made by the gentleman from Oklahoma is merely an informal report in the absence of the possession on his part of the papers. This report is insufficient to discharge our conferees, no action on the same having been taken. This informal action should not be treated as more than such, and if so regarded, then it is not that action which is considered necessary to discharge a committee of conference. But if our conference committee is still in existence, then the action of the Senate recommitting the report has not impinged in any wise upon our authority or dignity. It is a matter of no concern to us whether the recommitment in the Senate was effected by a point of order, or a formal motion.

It seems to me that the simplest way to deal with this situation would be for the gentleman from Oklahoma on behalf of

his committee to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the papers now in our possession, for the purpose of further conference with the Senate committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], the conference report is still in existence. No action whatever has been taken by the House that would discharge the House conferees. No action has been taken by the Senate to discharge its conferees. Therefore the conferees on the Indian appropriation bill are still in existence. By an irregularity the House conferees submitted a conference report under the rule when they, as a matter of fact, did not have the papers.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows, of course, that that is the usual procedure.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I know it is generally done; and no notice would have been taken of this, and no embarrassment would have occurred, if it had not been for the subsequent proceedings in the Senate; that report having been filed gave notice to the House, as far as the House was concerned, that the conferees had come to a decision upon a distinct agreement with the Senate. But subsequently the Senate disposed of the action of the conferees in a summary way, and instead of sending the papers back to conference, as they should have done, they messaged the papers over to the House, where they did not belong, and they are now on the Speaker's desk. It seems to me that the proper way to dispose of them is by unanimous consent or by a motion, made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, to refer the papers where they properly belong—to the committee of conference—just as an erroneous reference of a bill to a committee may on motion be properly referred to the committee to which it properly belongs.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the real point of controversy is whether there is in existence a conference committee on the part of the two Houses. If the Senate instead of rejecting the report of the conference committee, by virtue of a point of order made and sustained, had rejected the report by a direct vote, by which they simply turned down the conference, I assume it would not be contended that the conference committee was still in existence. Now, the same effect seems to follow when they reject a conference report on a point of order, and it seems to me that what the House ought to do is to agree that the papers shall be taken from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, agree to a conference, and appoint conferees, just as if the old conference committee were dead forever, and I think it is.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. But the Senate has not requested a conference.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then we should request a conference.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. What the gentleman from Kentucky says would be correct if the conference report had been rejected by the Senate on motion to that effect, but that is what the Senate did not do. A point of order was sustained against the report, and the new Senate rule provides that this specific action automatically recommits the matter under consideration to conference.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is the whole matter. The rule is what made the whole issue. It does not seem to me that a House has a right to reject a report—

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. We do the same thing here.

Mr. SHERLEY. What the House does is to reject the report and then it goes into a new conference.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The House often recommits a conference report to the conference committee. It took such action last summer on the conscription bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not reject it and then recommit it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The difficulty we got into arose when the Senate recommitment the bill to the committee of conference, and they messaged the news over here by the usual resolution, which would have been all right if they had not also sent the papers. But, while we have the physical possession of the papers, the Chair doubts very much whether we have them in the right way. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] cites a decision. The Chair has examined all these decisions, but they are not like the present case, because we have the physical possession of these papers. The Chair does not think the conference committee is dead. The Senate specifically referred it to the conferees.

If the committee of conference is alive, the only question is how to get these papers out of this House back to that conference committee, and the Chair thinks that the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is in order.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to prefer a parliamentary inquiry.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.  
Mr. FESS. When do the conferees cease—on the report of the committee here or upon the action of the House?

The SPEAKER. On the action of the House.

Mr. FESS. And if the action is negative, would it be the same as in an affirmative action?

The SPEAKER. If it is an affirmative action, they go out of existence automatically.

Mr. FESS. And a negative action?

The SPEAKER. If the House takes a negative action, they go out, too.

Mr. FESS. That is the question I had in mind.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. If the House was not in possession of these papers, then the Speaker would hold that the conferees continued their work as though no action had been had?

The SPEAKER. Of course. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to take the bill H. R. 8696, the Indian appropriation bill, from the Speaker's table and rerefer it to the conferees. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WHITE of Maine for the balance of this week, on account of urgent personal business.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11692, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and pending that motion I would ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] if we can not agree upon time for general debate. I would like to have that time just as short as we can have it.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I have investigated upon this side of the Chamber, and, while I am as anxious, perhaps more so, as the gentleman from Mississippi to get this cut short so that we can get down to the merits of what I consider a very good bill, yet I do not see how we can get along on this side with less than three hours.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state, if he has not done so, why three hours of general debate is requested on this bill, and further, whether it is to be debate confined to the bill itself or something that has no relation to it?

Mr. DAVIS. This is general debate, and the information that has come to me quite freely is that during the passage of the naval appropriation bill gentlemen did not have any opportunity for general debate at all, and they are trying, as it were, to unload the general debate upon that bill onto this bill.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I have this information, that some requests for time were made on the naval appropriation bill, and gentlemen who made those requests were asked to defer them and ask for time on this bill or some other bill, which was done under that sort of agreement with the leaders, because of the importance of getting the naval bill through.

Mr. DAVIS. I was stating the substance of the matter just as though the whole House had talked about it instead of the leaders.

Mr. Sisson. That information coming to me causes me to be a little more liberal in any agreement that I would make now. Would five hours in all be satisfactory to the gentleman? I do not think there would be more than two hours consumed on this side, and I will try to give the gentleman 30 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. If the gentleman will do that, it will be perfectly satisfactory to me, and when I say that I mean the Members on this side of the House who desire to talk.

Mr. Sisson. Then, Mr. Speaker, pending the motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to five hours, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two hours by myself.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To be confined to the bill?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. Sisson. I understand they do not want the debate confined to the bill. I would like to have it confined to the bill; but in doing that there will be nothing to talk about, because these gentlemen do not care to talk about the District appropriation bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi, pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, asks unanimous consent that general debate

upon the bill be limited to five hours, three hours of which are to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be confined to the bill.

The SPEAKER. And to that the gentleman from Tennessee makes the addendum that the debate be confined to the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I can not agree to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District appropriation bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS. If this motion is agreed to and the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the District appropriation bill, then under the rules of the House will gentlemen be confined to a discussion of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has nothing to do with the Committee of the Whole, but gives it as his own opinion that they would not. The question is on going into Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District appropriation bill, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 11692, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11692) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, in presenting this bill to the House for its consideration I deem it proper first that a short general statement be made outlining the general policy adopted by the subcommittee which made up this bill. The original estimates called for nearly \$5,000,000 more than is carried in this bill.

Wherever the program of the District Commissioners called for an expenditure of large sums of money in an extensive building program your committee denied the appropriation. The building program called for a million and three-quarter dollars for additions to schools alone. We called upon the District Commissioners and the board of education to state to your committee whether or not they believed that the building program could be carried out under present war conditions.

After quite a good deal of discussion it was agreed that the wisest thing to do would be to take care of the increase of children in the schools of the various sections by building portable school buildings. Your committee felt that it would be unwise to try to enter upon an extensive building program at this time. I will give you just one illustration of what we were up against. Three years ago an eight-room addition was proposed to one of the school buildings in the city and they asked for \$75,000. The committee gave the \$75,000. In the meantime the European war had broken out. When the time arrived they advertised for bids. The advertisements were made in accordance with the law, and the smallest bid they got was \$85,000. In last year's appropriation there was carried an appropriation of \$87,500—a leeway of \$2,500. They advertised for bids and the cheapest bid they got on the same building was \$141,000. The District Commissioners, of course, could not accept the bid because it was far in excess of the appropriation. The engineer commissioner said that unless the contracts were let at these enormous and criminal figures it would be utterly impossible to get the building done. Even then it is very doubtful whether or not it could be built on time, for it is doubtful if the building material could be had for this purpose at all.

The greater reason we had in our minds for not entering upon the building program at this time was that it would be an increased demand upon this labor market. The demand now is

far beyond the supply. It is absolutely impossible for the activities of the Government to get the labor essential to carrying on the war activities except with great difficulty.

Another reason was that this building program would necessitate contractors bringing quite a number of laborers into the District of Columbia, where the housing facilities are taxed beyond the capacity of the District already. The committee was absolutely harmonious on this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I will take this opportunity to say that the entire subcommittee that made up this bill were a unit on the proposition that everything should be done with an eye single to winning this war; that wherever the activities in civil life interfered with the proper prosecution of the war it was our duty to let the activities of civil life remain in abeyance until this war is won. At this time the efforts of all the American people should be turned to the one great object of our lives, and that is the proper prosecution of the war, because the very life of the Nation and the very liberties we have always held dearer than life are involved in this great struggle.

Mr. Chairman, it is also my privilege to state that during our deliberations it would have been impossible to have told who was a Democrat or who was a Republican because we were dealing with nonpartisan questions entirely in this bill. Each member of the committee was willing that where a civil activity interfered with a military necessity, we, without a dissenting vote, made the civil activity wait.

This is a momentous day in the history of the world. In making up this bill your committee never for one moment forgot the all-important question, "America must win the war." Since war was declared, as a member of this great committee, I have never permitted anything to prevent my making this the paramount question. Some have said that America should not have entered this war. While I differ with them, I will not now quarrel with them if they will now say that since we are in I am now with my country and we must win. If he will say my all is now upon the altar of my country and we must all pay, fight, and die, if need be, as one man for America and American ideals and to save our own liberty and the liberty of the world, I will forget his former position.

Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Members I may state here my position in reference to our duty as Members of Congress toward the war. I think it proper at this time to state my position, so that if you should see something needed to be done here in the District that is not done in this bill, your committee I think to a man will be in accord with me when I say that we left it undone because we would not do anything that would impede or interfere with our war program.

These are times that try men's souls and offer opportunities for service and heroism never before offered to a people in any age of the world's history. Opportunity for the greatest sacrifice is offered to us all in this favored land. No American can excuse himself from some kind of service. If he can not fight, he can pay; if he can not pay, he can labor; if he can neither labor or pay, he can pray. He can use his influence. He can help unify American sentiment. He can help arouse America to the proper sense of our danger, and this is a great service.

So I say every one in America can do something now for his country. Let us stop criticizing and confer with each other. Let us be tolerant with the opinion of others and be not too quick to question the other man's motive. He may be right. Let us all in the proper spirit, from the President down, try to prevent mistakes. Do not hesitate to call attention to dangers which we see, but do so in a true American spirit. If mistakes have been made, do not condemn, if the mistake was an honest one and there was no perfidy in it. Whatever a man's past opinion has been before the declaration of war, let us forget that, provided he is right now. I am not interested in an American's former attitude. What I am interested in is where do you stand now. Are you 100 per cent American now? Will you fight now? Will you pay now? Will you help now?

Every man in the South loves Robert E. Lee. But when the Civil War broke out Lee was not in accord with secession. What if he had been condemned on that ground? The South would have lost its greatest commander. No man will now say that Lee did not do his duty. So I say to all Americans who thought we should not have gone into this war I will not condemn you. I forget his former position if he is right now and stays right to the end. Those of us who are denied the high privilege of going to the front can show that we are right now, not by words but by acts and deeds. At the present moment every man can do the task we now have on hand. The most important present task is to raise the money for the third liberty loan. Do it now. I will never question the young boy's patriotism who goes to France and gives his young life

fighting bravely the battles of liberty for America solely because before we got into the struggle this boy thought we should not go into the fight. Nor will I question the patriotism of the man who now gives his money and his boy and is willing to give his life for the cause solely because he differed with me about going into this war. Look over America to-day. How many, many men were opposed to our going into the war but are now doing their full duty by their country and are now in the forefront of the battle, even though denied the honor of going into the fighting line.

The Capital City can not afford to be a slacker city in any line. Every officer and employee of the Government has an opportunity to show the Nation and the world by their example what the real spirit of the Nation is. Buy bonds to the limit of your ability. More than that, become more efficient in your work than ever before. Do not complain if the task assigned is hard. Perform it and do it well. If it takes overtime, do it and be thankful for the opportunity to serve your Government in this hour of peril. Think of the service the noble boys in the ranks are compelled to perform in sunshine, in cold, and in rain. Keep that picture in your mind and the task at your desk will seem light.

Let the American spirit of 1775 be the spirit of 1918. Let the battle cry of Patrick Henry, uttered in old St. John's Episcopal Church, at Richmond, Va., where the Virginia convention was held, be America's cry to-day. When men were doubtful and wavering this patriot's words, "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death," went quivering and shivering along the veins and arteries of all patriots from Maine to Georgia. Young America buckled on the sword and shouldered the musket for human liberty.

It was 143 years ago this month, on that beautiful spring morning of April, 1775, when the Minute Men at Lexington were fired upon. That was the shot which "was heard round the world." The same sacred cause is calling us. The same cause for which Patrick Henry spoke the inspired words in old St. John's Church is the same cause for which I speak now. Little did Maj. Pitcairn dream when he ordered his soldiers to fire that shot at Lexington that he had released an irresistible and unconquerable force which started a chain of events which is now culminating in the world strife of to-day. Its echoes aroused the Green Mountain boys—caused Putnam to leave the plow in the furrow. Patrick Henry gave voice to the true American sentiment in every liberty-loving heart, and called the patriots of Virginia and the Carolinas, yea, the patriots of all the South, and with the patriots of all the North as brethren in the great struggle for liberty, which continued until the Declaration of Independence became an established fact and America became a land of free men.

Again, in 1812, the same sentiment aroused our people to a new and broader defense of our liberties and freedom, and the victory of American patriots under Andrew Jackson at New Orleans gave America and all nations the right to sail the seas.

The same spirit caused the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine, which was a declaration of independence for all the Western Hemisphere. It was this same spirit which found its way along the Sierras of Mexico and gave her the power to end the long-continued misrule of Spain. It was this same spirit that caused the same battle cry to reverberate up and down the length of the Andes and over the llanos and pampas of South America, and called our brethren of South America to struggle for freedom, until under the leadership of Simon Bolivar the last shackles of slavery were stricken off and the colonies of the Spanish grandees became free nations. Oceans were no barriers to this sentiment of freedom, for it leaped the turbulent waters of the Atlantic, and the people of Europe admit the benefits of the American Revolution. In England, France, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden they revere the name of Washington, and the Fourth of July is with them a sacred day. Yea, France filled with this sentiment found in America her example, and in her struggle for freedom found the new inspiration in this example and has become one of the freest people on earth. Yea, the downtrodden and oppressed people of all nations are longing for the same freedom for themselves.

But to-day the issue is not that of one nation struggling to be free. This is a world struggle for freedom. The forces of darkness and hate have ranged themselves under the banner of autocracy and for the subjugation of the world. They are being met by the hosts of free nations who will never, in my judgment, cease the conflict until the American idea of liberty is crowned with victory and men everywhere have the right to be at peace with the rest of mankind and among themselves.

This great American idea of liberty and freedom is not confined to martial affairs and the roar of cannon and machine



guns. Every struggle for the betterment of humanity is but a continuation of the battle for the rights of man. The right to be free; the right of every man to feel that he is a sovereign and to obey only the dictates of his own conscience and laws that define the civic rights of all with no special discrimination or favors to the strong; the right to free and popular education; the right of complete and absolute separation of the Church and State with absolute toleration for all religions and favors for none; the right of trial by jury sacredly secured; the right of open legislative assemblies; the right of writ of habeas corpus except when suspended by proper authority in time of war; the right to be confronted with witnesses in open court; the right of absolute and untrammelled freedom of speech and press; the right of the people to peaceably assemble to discuss for themselves matters of public and private interest; the right of petition by the people for any grievance they may have; the right of equal and uniform taxation and an economical government honestly administered so that labor may be lightly burdened and equal right to all under the law, no titles of royalty by birth or by law, and no life tenures of office are some of the touchstones of Democracy announced by America for the guidance of the world. For these we are battling to-day. For the preservation of these rights and principles let us pledge our property, our lives, and our sacred honor.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of Congress, I am sure, shares with me these sentiments and convictions. The American people as a whole also have the same sublime sense of duty. I am willing to lay aside everything to win the war. We must suffer some inconveniences—so must the people of the District of Columbia. I am sure that they are willing to suffer some inconvenience.

But we do not propose to neglect the children. We do not believe it wise that the children be denied at any costs proper educational opportunities. We should be willing to sacrifice all luxury and comfort for them. Therefore the District Commissioners and the Board of Education prepared a statement of the portable buildings that would be needed to take care of the overcrowded schools. Your committee gave them that amount of money and that item is made immediately available in this bill, so that accounts for the large item you will find in the bill in reference to public schools. We left out, however, the expensive building program.

Another item to which I would call your attention, which is not usually in a District bill, is an item of \$25,000 for the Council of National Defense. The activities under this head are similar to those performed in the States by the State government in reference to the selective draft. For instance, in the various counties throughout the States the governor selects those members in the various counties who become the draft board of the county, and the States have been bearing a certain proportion of that expense. In other words, certain of those State officials do not get any money for their services; a few of them do—those who devote all of their time and attention. Now, the performance of that duty was devolved upon the District Commissioners. It became necessary for them to have a great deal of stationery, to employ some extra services; and the District officials who gave their time to it get nothing and will get nothing, except one clerk, who gets an increase of \$300 a year, which is carried in another item. With that exception, this \$25,000 is intended for the District's share in taking care of the selective draft.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is it intended out of this \$25,000 to pay the salaries of members of the exemption boards here in the District?

Mr. Sisson. No; they, as a rule, get no salary.

Mr. HASTINGS. So far as I am advised, if the gentleman will permit me, in my State of Oklahoma no member of any exemption board was paid anything.

Mr. Sisson. That is true in my State, also.

Mr. HASTINGS. And the clerical force volunteered their services throughout the State of Oklahoma. Now, I do think perhaps some of their expenses were paid, and it is my information—

Mr. Sisson. The expenses are paid in the gentleman's State as well as the others.

Mr. HASTINGS. My information is that nothing was paid in salaries, but they all volunteered their services; and I was just wondering what salaries were to be paid out of this appropriation of \$25,000. I was in hopes the people here in the District of Columbia were as patriotic and could be depended upon to volunteer their services the same as in the States throughout the Union.

Mr. Sisson. I will say to the gentleman no salary has been paid to these various boards throughout the States. It is only to certain of the clerical force; and then they have had to rent some property. But this board here is also endeavoring to assist in taking care of the housing proposition for the people who are brought here by the War Department and Navy Department.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Is it not true that each member of these exemption boards is entitled to draw \$3 a day if he desires to do so, but that in many cases the members have waived that and volunteered their services?

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will yield just a moment further, let me say that that was true out in Oklahoma, but the governor of the State of Oklahoma notified the members that if they wanted to draw any salary he would accept their resignation, and but very few of them resigned under those circumstances. And as the result of it, as I understand, none of them were paid any salary at all, although perhaps a few were paid expenses.

Mr. MAPES. I think that in the country over very many have volunteered their services.

Mr. Sisson. That is true.

In addition to the activity that I have just mentioned they have down on New York Avenue an office, and they also maintain a booth in the Union Station, so that in the event that employees, especially young ladies, come to the city of Washington, the Civil Service Commission notifies them that there is a booth at the Union Station and an office down on New York Avenue, to which they can apply for assistance in getting rooms, because that has been an extremely difficult problem, not only to get a room in which they may physically stop, but to endeavor to get a room at a reasonable price. And if Congress does not in some way protect us against the exorbitant prices that are charged Government clerks and other officers and employees we will be compelled to radically increase their salary. So your committee thought, after investigation, that this was money wisely spent. You may ask how it has been taken care of in the past. It was taken care of by the President out of the \$100,000,000 contingent fund. So your committee thought that that was a proper expenditure and allowed the sum.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. FESS. None of this \$25,000 is taken out of the District treasury? It is all taken out of the Federal Treasury, is it not?

Mr. Sisson. No; half of it.

Mr. FESS. Why should half of it be taken out of the District treasury?

Mr. Sisson. Because the District of Columbia and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia feel that, just as the States of the Union pay, some of them, large sums of money—

Mr. FESS. I was not aware of that. I did not suppose the States paid.

Mr. Sisson. Some of them raised as much as a million dollars, and some of them much more than that, for national defense.

Mr. FESS. Is that voluntary on the part of the State or statutory?

Mr. Sisson. It is statutory. The legislatures, you know, make the appropriations.

Mr. FESS. To take care of the draft?

Mr. Sisson. No; not to take care of the draft, but to take care of what they call the national defense or State defense. They have a State defense organization in every State of the Union, so far as I know, where the State is endeavoring to take care of—

Mr. FESS. I understand that, but what I was confused over was the statement that the \$25,000 was applied to take care of the draft here in the District.

Mr. Sisson. No; take care of certain stationery accounts. All the States had that to pay, except the blanks. For instance, the correspondence between the local boards and the drafted men sometimes gets to be quite expensive. There is a certain character of that work that ought to have been made, in my judgment, subject to frank, but certain letters have not been frankable, and they have had to pay quite a good deal of money out of the State treasury in connection with the draft. Now, there are certain services that are paid for, specifically enumerated in the military bill, and those employees are paid directly out of the Federal Treasury. But this is an entirely separate and distinct character of activity from that.

Now, I want to call your attention to the street improvements. The streets of the city of Washington are not in good condition. Your subcommittee visited the streets. You can find a great

deal more by a personal visit to a street than you can by testimony. Your subcommittee went over the streets out in the outskirts of the city, the real estate activities. A remarkable thing happened with your subcommittee. We each had a sheet of paper with the proposed streets to be improved written on it. Neither of us knew what the other's idea was, and agreed not to discuss it until we got back into the committee. Each member of the subcommittee had his streets marked for himself indicating his opinion at the time as to the necessity of improving it. Neither of us knew what the other's opinion was until we got back into the committee and began marking up the bill, and my recollection is we differed only as to one street.

Now, to be frank about the street proposition. There are many of the streets in the outskirts where there were only a few houses, maybe only one or two on the street, where it was a purely real estate proposition, as it struck us. Now, to put all that building program in would be a great burden upon the railroads to bring material, and a further demand upon the labor of the District. The enormous prices to be paid now for materials and labor caused your subcommittee to give money for streets that they thought were imperatively necessary to be laid. But when we came to consider the condition of the important streets in the old portion of the city, as well as what is called the "suburban roads"—I do not know why they make that distinction, because you go out of one portion of that imaginary division now into the other without knowing it—wherever the money was to be expended in repair, your subcommittee gave them every dollar they asked.

We thought it wise to keep the streets already laid in repair. The very severe winter, the enormous amount of heavy hauling, that has not heretofore been so general for so long a time, has put the streets in bad condition and broken them up into holes. So your subcommittee gave every dollar asked for on the street repair. The repair fund is an entirely different fund from the fund for laying new pavement and new sidewalks. Now, if we had laid the original pavement on these new streets, of course the property owners would have paid their pro rata share of the amount under the law.

But your subcommittee were not deterred on that account. The two propositions were, first, the enormous price to be paid, and, second, the absolute and imperative necessity of not making greater the demand for labor and the fact that we wanted to conserve every dollar that we could in the prosecution of the war. So the same reasoning that prompted your subcommittee not to enter into a building program as to the schools, but to adopt some portable buildings, was the impelling motive that caused your subcommittee not to enter into a system of general street improvements throughout the city. Those are the two items—street improvements and schools—where the subcommittee was able to save the greatest amount of money.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will permit, I want to know why should the United States pay for the paving of Washington streets, except in front of public buildings?

Mr. SISSON. I will say to my good friend that he has asked a question that I myself have asked many times, but your subcommittee is not dealing with that proposition, because we are an appropriating committee and not a legislative committee. If the gentleman had been here during one of the very severe fights we had on this bill in past years, when my friend from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] and I labored together on this subcommittee, he would have seen the terrific fight that we made to get the property owners to pay anything on the streets or sidewalks, and he would then understand some of the reasons why that is now the law. But that, of course, would be aside from this discussion.

Mr. JUUL. Under what method are you proceeding? What percentage is the property holder paying for the local improvements on his property?

Mr. SISSON. Twenty-five per cent of the original payment is made by the property owner on each side, and 25 per cent from the National Treasury and 25 per cent from the District treasury. That, however, has not long been the law; but that is the law now, which we can not change in an appropriation bill because it would be subject to a point of order. With the gentleman's indulgence I would like to avoid getting into a discussion of that.

Mr. JUUL. With the flood of gold that is poured from all the States of the Union into this city, why should the Federal Government be required to pay half of the running expenses of this city?

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will permit me, I think every Member will understand that I do not agree to the half-and-half proposition.

Mr. JUUL. Why should the Federal Government pay any of it?

Mr. SISSON. I do not think it should, except for the Federal Government's activities here. The gentleman and I agree on that proposition absolutely. Congress passed a law some years ago, and it is incumbent upon us either to repeal the law or to carry it out.

Mr. JUUL. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time; but even if it is the law, it is not necessarily like the laws of the Medes and Persians, is it?

Mr. SISSON. It seems that it is. We have tried two or three times to pass a bill to annul that half-and-half arrangement, and we have passed it through this body, but when it went to another body it was hung up there and finally disagreed to. Once the House voted 2 to 1 in favor of abolishing the half-and-half proposition, and we got the bill into the other body, and there it was held up for quite a while, until we finally ceased to have conferences, and then the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] made a motion to refer the whole proposition to a joint commission of the two Houses. That joint commission was appointed, and those of us who wanted to abolish the half-and-half plan knew then that that was the burial ground of our attempts to abolish the half-and-half proposition, and our project was decently buried.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to get this straight. Suppose a side street here in Washington, with no Government property facing it, is to be paved. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that they put their hands into the Federal Treasury and pave that side street with Government money?

Mr. SISSON. They do.

Mr. JUUL. And you gentlemen have stood for it?

Mr. SISSON. I have not, so that the gentleman's comments do not in any way affect me. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and a member of the subcommittee having charge of this bill, and as such member I endeavor to assist in making appropriations in accordance with the law. Wherever it is proposed to change the existing law I have always made it a rule to refer the matter to the proper committee or to call the attention of that committee to it. Under the rules of the House this committee can not legislate.

Mr. MEEKER. Of course the gentleman understands that the Federal Government does not even go half-and-half on the franchise. The people here do not vote.

Mr. SISSON. I must decline to yield for the purpose of going into that.

Now, there is one other matter that I want to call to your attention. Heretofore and at the present time the District of Columbia has its garbage cared for by contract. They let out a contract to the lowest bidder. The contract now for taking care of the garbage is \$69,000, and that bid expires on the 1st of July. They advertised for bids for the next year, as the law directs, and they first got a bid for \$133,000, which they rejected because it was too high. They then advertised again for bids to take care of the garbage, and the lowest bid they could get on the second advertisement, according to the testimony, was \$143,000. The man making the bid for \$143,000 accompanied his bid with a certified check for \$3,000. When the time came to enter into the contract, he declined to enter into the contract and forfeited the \$3,000.

The District Commissioners then made an effort to get bidders. They failed. The 1st of July is rapidly approaching. The garbage of the District would not be cared for unless we could get some legislation. This matter was called to the attention of the District legislative committee, and they reported a bill which was passed through the House recently.

Now, in accordance with the provisions of that bill—I do not know, but I presume that the bill will pass the Senate today or to-morrow; my information is that the bill was reported without amendment from the legislative committee of the Senate—in accordance with the provisions of that bill we have put in an item in this bill prepared by the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and that is made immediately available for the purpose of taking care of the garbage.

It is not necessary for me to explain to you the alternative propositions in that bill, because all the Members of the House were here and heard that discussion at some length. But that item is also in the bill, and will be on its face a considerable increase; it does not matter whether we adopt one or the other of the three propositions. When we reach that item, if there is any controversy about it, I will take time to explain it.

Your committee gave to the school board 146 new teachers. While this seems to be, and is, a very great increase in the number of teachers, the population of the District of Columbia has increased remarkably since the outbreak of the war. The majority of the schools are very much overcrowded, as shown



by the testimony before your committee. We went as carefully as we could over the matter, taking the number of children that a teacher ought to have, and, as nearly as we could, estimated the number of additional teachers; and we gave the 146 additional teachers with the understanding with the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools that no additional teachers should be employed who were not actually needed. It was very difficult for your subcommittee to determine with absolute exactitude just how many additional teachers would be needed.

We made some investigation of the salaries of the teachers and some little examination into the amount paid to teachers in other cities of about the size of Washington. In the higher-grade places we found that the teachers here are paid more than they are paid in the majority of cities, but in the lower grades, while the salaries are as much as they are in some cities, they are less than in some places. For example, a teacher getting \$50 a month, or \$600 a year, would be getting just about what she would get in the majority of cities like Louisville, St. Louis, and cities of that character; but in those cities we found that the kindergarten teachers and some of the teachers of the lower grades were paid higher salaries than were paid to teachers in higher grades. Speaking for myself, I think this is wise, and I think I also speak the sentiment to a large extent of the subcommittee that investigated this matter. We felt that the teachers of the lower grades, selected for their knowledge of child life, teachers capacitated to take care of little children and to start them in the lower grades, should be paid higher salaries than those in the higher grades, where the children are old enough to be able to help themselves to some extent.

We thought if there should be a difference, and if we were making the school laws and had to do with the rearrangement of the law, we would make the salaries in those lower grades higher. But we could not go fairly into this matter, because if you will examine the longevity law of the District of Columbia my friends on the committee will bear me out in the statement that it is one of those mysteries which even the experts themselves can not tell you about, as to the exact amount that will be needed to pay the expenses of the public schools, because you can not tell the number of resignations, you can not tell the number of deaths, and so on, so that if you can come within \$25,000 or \$30,000 of estimating what will be necessary under that longevity arrangement you will do pretty well. So in increasing the salaries your subcommittee took the lower-grade teachers, and if you will look at the report you will find the exact number of teachers whose salaries we increased. The amount necessary to pay for the increased number of teachers is \$127,250 and the amount necessary to pay the increase of salaries is \$124,100. Now, you can not grant a small increase in the lower grades without running up into figures pretty rapidly, because in the lower grades we increase the salaries of 936 teachers; in class 3, 498; in class 2, 352; and in class 1, 86.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. A great deal of this is a revelation to me.

Mr. Sisson. It is to a great many Members.

Mr. JUUL. While the Government performs a great many functions, yet the United States Government as a Government has no children. Now, can the gentleman see any reason why the people in this city, having \$100,000,000 or \$125,000,000 poured in here by the National Government from all the States of the Union—can the gentleman give me any reason why the National Government should assist in paying the cost of educating the children in the city of Washington?

Mr. Sisson. I will say to the gentleman that personally—I do not want to embarrass any member of the committee—but expressing my own view, personally I see no reason why they should do it. In order that I may get that matter behind me, let me state my position in relation to taxation in the District of Columbia, then the gentleman will understand my position and will see that he and I do not disagree as to the principle.

Mr. JUUL. The position the gentleman occupies is as an appropriator of public money; and is the law such that it is compulsory—

Mr. Sisson. Absolutely.

Mr. JUUL (continuing). To appropriate money in the bill so as to assess the citizens of the United States in a matter which in decency the residents of the District ought to pay themselves?

Mr. Sisson. We are complying with the law.

Mr. JUUL. I do not want to get into an argument with the gentleman—

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I have stated my position, and I hope it will satisfy the gentleman. I can not go into the reasons of bad laws that we have in the District of Columbia. If I could write the law, I would provide a reasonable rate of taxation on a reasonable assessment of property of all the people of the District of Columbia. Then I would collect those taxes and put them into the Treasury; and when we appropriated money out of the Federal Treasury we would appropriate the balance needed. There is going to be a surplus of about \$2,000,000 if we get the bill through as it is written—\$1,900,000 left over in the District treasury. If I could have my way about it, I would use that million and odd thousand dollars in paying the expenses of this bill and then let the balance of the money necessary to pay the expenses of the bill be paid out of the Federal Treasury, because manifestly under the Government supervision there are many things that this District ought not to pay and nobody wants them to pay. They are governmental activities. Nobody wants the District of Columbia, for example, to pave the streets and sidewalks around Government property. The Government ought to pay something. Another thing: In laying out the city of Washington, it was laid out on a more magnificent scale than are commercial cities in other States. It is true the people bought property after the streets were laid out. I have stated to my friend what could be done and what in the nature of things is a feasible thing to do.

Now, coming back to the teachers. We give the teachers receiving \$500 an increase of salary to \$750; class 2, receiving \$600, to \$750; and those receiving \$650 were given \$750. Now, in addition to that, they will get the \$120 increase, making a total of \$870 as the lowest-paid teacher in the District of Columbia. Your subcommittee thought that was a fair increase in salary, and it is very much higher than the average of that paid by any city I know of in the United States.

There is another matter to which I wish to call your attention in reference to school activities. While we did not give all the amount of money the District Commissioners asked for, we gave \$12,900 for dental clinics, which was perhaps less than half of what they asked for.

Another new departure to which I call the attention of the committee is the creation of the two-platoon system in the fire companies.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. My information is that the average school building is very much congested now with children. How generally are the portable houses going to be used?

Mr. Sisson. We gave them all that they asked for. It is quite a long story, but I will say that we had the board of education submit to us a statement as to the number of children in each school and the number that could not be accommodated, and we took the number to be accommodated in each portable school building and gave them enough money to build portable buildings to take care of the surplus children.

Mr. MAPES. So next year you estimate that all the children in the District will be taken care of?

Mr. Sisson. Absolutely, if the figures and estimates are correct. We make the fund immediately available, so that the portable buildings can be provided. Of course, that cuts out \$2,000,000 for school buildings that we had in the bill.

Mr. MAPES. How many school children can be accommodated in the portable buildings?

Mr. Sisson. From recollection, I think something like 200 portable buildings, and you can estimate 40 children to a school building, so that gives about 8,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Does the gentleman mean to say that this bill adds 200 schools to the number already existing?

Mr. Sisson. Oh, no; not 200 schools; nothing like that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Already there are 300 school-houses in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will understand, what they call a portable building is a little room. For example, at one of these schools where they need an eight-room addition, they will have three or four of these little portable buildings. They have that all outlined here in the testimony. If the gentleman will turn to page 589 of the hearings he will find that the John Eaton School, the Tennallytown School, the Petworth School, and so on, are all taken up, and a number of pages of testimony are devoted to the number of children at each of these buildings, and the number of rooms they would need. When you say you want an eight-room addition to a school building, that means that you practically have eight portable school buildings there, because each portable building is a unit. Therefore you would

have eight portable buildings. We were confronted with this proposition: Either the children must go without education for the next year, because there is no place to house them, or we had to provide these temporary buildings. I will say that it did not satisfy the board of education nor the commissioners, and not a single member of your subcommittee was at all satisfied, but if we had appropriated over \$2,000,000, which would have been necessary, there would have been no certainty that we would have gotten one-half or even one-third of the space that the \$2,000,000 ought to buy. In addition to that, there is no certainty that any one of these buildings would have been put up, so it was either a portable building or let the children go without school facilities, and we adopted that alternative, although it is not a thing that we like to do.

Mr. MAPES. Does the bill provide for the increased number of teachers that it will be necessary to have?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Perhaps the gentleman made this clear; but in regard to the increase of salaries to the teachers, what would be the lowest salary paid to any teacher in the District?

Mr. Sisson. \$870.

Mr. MAPES. That is the basic salary of \$750 plus the \$120 increase?

Mr. Sisson. Yes. The lowest salary would be \$870. Calculate the longevity pay, and the gentleman will have to get that table to figure that out, and after a teacher has been here one year the lowest salary then paid to the second-year teacher would amount to about \$900.

Mr. MAPES. They get their longevity pay in addition to the \$870?

Mr. Sisson. That is the law; we could not change that. The next year they would get \$925, then \$950, \$975, and so on up to \$1,000. If we had increased arbitrarily a teacher's salary who had been in her fourth year to the \$1,000, that would give something like \$1,200 and odd, so your subcommittee endeavored to make the salary of the lower-grade teachers the same, and made it \$750 plus the \$120 and plus whatever longevity pay they may get.

I had just started to talk about the two-platoon system. The two-platoon system was gone into with a good deal of care by your subcommittee. It seems in most of the cities they are beginning to adopt the two-platoon system. When you consider the matter first, you would imagine it would take twice as many men to run a two-platoon system as a one-platoon system. That is not true. It takes about 30 per cent more men, and that is done by catching up the slack. For instance, for five days the firemen are on duty for 23 hours, and then they are off one whole day and then off a half. Therefore by catching up that slack and leaving one less man on duty at each fire house, by increasing the force in the District 144 men we are able to let every man spend every other night at home. He may not take his time in that way. He might take a week and spend that week at home at night, and the next week at the fire engine house at night. The testimony showed to your committee that many of these firemen would go home and see their children but once a week, and as one of them expressed it, some of their children hardly knew them. These men render splendid service and they did not ask for any additional salary at all. What they asked for was an opportunity to spend some time at home, and I do not believe that I am betraying anyone's confidence when I say that your subcommittee was unanimous in its report upon this proposition.

Now, by taking 144 men, officers and men, which is about 30 per cent increase over the present force, we are enabled to let the firemen stay at home one day 14 hours and on duty 10 hours. The next day it would be just the reverse, he would stay 14 hours at home and on duty 10 hours and the next day 10 hours at home and 14 on duty. Or you could adopt another plan, 8 hours, 12 hours, and 16 hours. That is, you have three shifts but by arranging the shifts so that they lap into each other you can arrange that a man shall be on duty 8 hours and off duty 12 hours, and the next week be off duty 16 and then go on duty 16 and off 8 and in that way you enable the force at all times to be full and yet enable the firemen to spend practically half their nights at home. So we gave them 144 additional firemen for that reason.

Now, I do not know that there is any other item in the bill to which I wish to call especial attention. We granted increases in some clerical services. For instance, the stenographers were getting, some of them, \$800 or \$900. Now, the Federal Government was paying very much more than this, \$1,500 some of them, and the District government was unable to keep any stenographers. Our own clerks get \$2,000, so your subcommittee recommended to the full committee and to the Congress that the

stenographers get a salary of about \$100 a month, about \$1,200. Now, that has been running through the bill generally—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. Sisson. I do.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think that a stenographer should get more than a school-teacher who helps to educate and train the children? I do not. There is not an occupation in the United States that is so important to the welfare of the United States as that of the teachers who instruct the children, and they are, as a class, among the poorest paid. They take the child at the formative age, when habits are in the formation—

Mr. Sisson. I will say to the gentleman I used to teach school myself, and my sympathies are with the school-teachers; but in my judgment when school-teaching gets to be a profession—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, will the gentleman permit an interruption—

Mr. Sisson. One moment; let me make this statement—where the individual engaged in the school work is making that a life work and not a stepping stone to something else, then the services rendered in every community in the United States would be such that in 30 years they would impress their value upon every community to that extent that the whole sentiment of the country would be for paying them wages that are comparable with the duties which they perform. What I mean is this: The teachers of the country could in one generation so impress themselves upon the country that their value would be apparent.

But it is utterly impossible for the District of Columbia to be put in the attitude of paying vastly more for school-teachers than is paid in any other portion of the country. Now, with this increase that this bill provides, the pay that the school-teachers will get is considerably greater than that paid in other communities and in other cities the size of Washington. Now, if there is an injustice done here, the injustice is done in the gentleman's State and in my State; it is done in every State in the Union; it is done by people who pay their own taxes; it is done by people who do their own voting in their own cities, towns, and villages. We are most liberal here, and, taking into consideration the fact that at this particular time it becomes our duty to try to conserve every possible dollar we can, in order that we may put every dollar we can in this war, your subcommittee did not grant increases in salary except where we felt an injustice would be done to an employee of the District of Columbia by virtue of the physical cost of food and the physical cost of living.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the indulgence of the Chair just a moment—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for—

Mr. Sisson. For five minutes. I really do not want any more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to talk for so long a time, and if the gentleman from Minnesota desires to use—

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I have been looking around for some of the gentlemen to whom I promised time, but I do not see them, and I have telephoned half a dozen—

Mr. Sisson. I have no objection to yielding if some gentleman desires to speak.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the salary that a teacher receives in the District of Columbia the first year?

Mr. Sisson. Well, the teacher who is regularly employed the first year gets \$600.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is \$50 a month?

Mr. Sisson. Well, \$60 a month, because they work only 10 school months. They get \$60 a month, but it is practically like getting \$50 a month if the gentleman wants to put it that way.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, then, if he or she is very faithful and diligent the first year, how much do they get the second year?

Mr. Sisson. Now, you will have to get that table. I think the increase is \$25, maybe \$30.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. A year?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.



Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What do they get the third year?

Mr. SISSON. Six hundred and fifty dollars, if I am correct about the longevity increase.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And what do they get the fourth year?

Mr. SISSON. Six hundred and seventy-five dollars and—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. When does it end?

Mr. SISSON. At the end of 10 years.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How much do they get then?

Mr. SISSON. You can make the calculation yourself. Some of them get \$1,000—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the teacher begins at \$600 a year, and is faithful, and lives in the city of Washington, and pays the prices for edibles and other things that she has to pay here, at the end of 10 years she gets \$1,000. You are not expecting—

Mr. SISSON. I do not expect them to do anything. I do not want the gentleman to imagine that I am myself—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am taking the facts as the gentleman gives them.

Mr. SISSON. I have simply stated to the gentleman, and I state now, that this is what we have done and just what we believe is right, and no amount of cross-examination could in any way change my attitude toward the matter at all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not expect to change the gentleman's views, but I am trying to get at the facts.

Mr. SISSON. Those are the facts. I have stated them to you.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman stated, as I understood him, that when the teachers indicated that they proposed to make teaching their profession—

Mr. SISSON. Not only here. I took the whole country.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am applying it to Washington. He said that then they would increase the wages. If they start in a profession that occupies 10 years before they get \$900, then at the end of 30 years the whole country would rise up and give them compensation that they can live on?

Mr. SISSON. Let me say this to the gentleman, that in my judgment the whole trouble about the school system in the District of Columbia is that it is too much inbred now. Under the longevity system it does not make any difference whether the teachers are efficient or inefficient. You keep them on, and the longer you keep them the more money they get. That ought not to be. There ought to be some elasticity, so that when a teacher shows fitness the teacher may be promoted in accordance with the service rendered, and not in accordance with the number of years of teaching.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. For fear that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have a misapprehension in reference to the minimum basic pay, they received, to start with, \$600, and we raised it to \$750, and the general increase would be \$870.

Mr. SISSON. If you add the general increase, it would be \$870.

Mr. LAZARO. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi this question. Is it not a fact that in a country like ours, where the people rule, a school-teacher should be one of the best-posted and one of the best-paid men in the land?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SISSON. Unless the gentleman from Minnesota will indicate some—

Mr. DAVIS. Do you not think that we had better rise now?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11692, making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that perhaps I myself have occupied too much time in my remarks, but I ask unanimous consent that the general debate upon this bill be limited to—

Mr. DAVIS. I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that his statement was so beneficial that we will not consider that he took too long. I suggest that he retain two hours.

Mr. SISSON. I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to five hours additional, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to five hours additional to what has already been had, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GARNER. Not to exceed five hours.

The SPEAKER. Yes; not to exceed five hours. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MIE URATAKE (H. DOC. NO. 107).

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 27, 1918.

To the SPEAKER HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to invite attention to the communication from this department, dated February 19, 1916, transmitting a petition of Mie Uratake, widow of Torabachi Uratake, for indemnity on account of the killing of her husband, a Japanese subject, by Private India Adams, Company K, Twenty-fifth Infantry, at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, November 25, 1915. There was also transmitted, in addition to other papers, a copy of the court-martial record of the trial and conviction of Private Adams upon a charge of manslaughter in that he "did, through negligence and carelessness in the handling of his rifle, shoot and kill T. Uratake, a Japanese." The record shows that petition and other papers were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. No. 785, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), and that subsequently a bill was introduced (H. R. 19899) for the relief of Mrs. Uratake; but apparently no further action has been taken. This office has been informed by the Secretary of State that that department has written a letter, dated March 26, 1918, to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, urging the enactment of the desired legislation in this case and inviting attention to the fact that that department is informed that Mrs. Uratake is in straitened circumstances, and also to the fact that the Japanese ambassador at this Capital has again made inquiry concerning the status of the matter.

It is the view of this department that this is a case in which it would be proper for Congress to grant the relief requested, and it is therefore recommended that the necessary legislation to this end be enacted. In this connection reference is made to a similar recommendation made in the case of Tatsuji Saito, a Japanese subject, who was killed, presumably by American soldiers, at Camp San Geronimo, Mex., May 25, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 194, 65th Cong., 1st sess.).

Respectfully,

BENEDICT CROWELL,  
Acting Secretary of War.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. May I ask what is the date of the letter referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

The SPEAKER. March 26. This was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday for to-morrow be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting Twelfth Annual Report of the American Red Cross (H. Doc. No. 2131, 64th Cong., 2d sess.), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from Committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4283) authorizing the donation of the land and building at Kennebunkport, Me., known as the old customhouse, to the town of Kennebunkport, Me., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 528), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7225) providing for the transfer to the custody

and control of the War Department property in San Francisco, Cal., known as the old Subtreasury property, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 529), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10663) to convey a strip of land on the site of the Federal building at Princeton, Ind., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 530), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3134) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 531), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9544) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Ollis, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 11824) providing for an examination and preliminary survey of the watershed of the Skagit River, in the State of Washington, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11825) providing for an examination and preliminary survey of the watershed of the Nooksack River and the North Fork, South Fork, and Middle Fork thereof, in the State of Washington, with a view to the control of the floods of said river and forks; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11826) granting the consent of Congress to the Sonoma Land Co., a corporation, to construct a bridge across Second Napa Slough; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAIGE: Resolution (H. Res. 331) directing the Clerk of the House to post conspicuously in the House wing of the Capitol and in the House Office Building notices of committee hearings in advance thereof; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 332) relating to the smoke nuisance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SWIFT: Resolution (H. Res. 333) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department to audit certain accounts and expenditures of the War Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

By Mr. SNYDER: Resolution (H. Res. 334) transferring jurisdiction of Indian reservations in the State of New York, not now specifically assumed by the Government, to the State of New York; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. POUL: Resolution (H. Res. 335) providing for the consideration of House bill 8938; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11827) granting an increase of pension to Levi Ritter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 11828) granting an increase of pension to William Schooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 11829) granting a pension to Charles Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 11830) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 11831) granting a pension to John N. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11832) granting a pension to Charles D. Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11833) for the relief of Seth J. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11834) for the relief of William Henry Coleman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11835) for the relief of Jimmie Lou Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11836) for the relief of Mary Holloman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUNN: A bill (H. R. 11837) granting a pension to Mary H. McCahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 11838) granting a pension to Victor A. Benson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11839) granting a pension to George W. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 11840) granting a pension to Eugenie Schottmueller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 11841) granting a pension to Hugh Mackay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 11842) granting a pension to Ella Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 11843) granting an increase of pension to John Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11844) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11845) granting an increase of pension to William Burch, alias A. M. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11846) granting an increase of pension to William Kildow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of members of the Phenix Farm Club, Walnut Grove, Mo., asking that farmers be assured a reasonable profit above cost of production; also, petition of lay inspectors, grades 1 and 2, station at St. Joseph, Mo., asking increase in salary; also, a resolution of the Southwestern Millers' League, indorsing House bill 10957, establishing standards of weights and measures for flour, meal, and commercial feeding stuff; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), resolution of the Independent Order of Foresters, Highlandtown, Md., pledging loyalty to the President in the prosecution of the war; also, a resolution of the Board of Directors of the School District of St. Joseph, Mo., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the First Baptist Church, Enterprise, Oreg., urging war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of the National Dairy Conference, demanding the repeal of the second-class postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of Local No. 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, favoring repeal of second-class postage provisions of war-revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, against profiteering in rents in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), memorial of Roger Casement Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Boston, Mass., against conscription in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Resolution of the Grand Commandery of the Knights Templar of California, unanimously opposing peace without victory and pledging support to the Government, the cause, and the flag until the war is won; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of Elk Grove (Cal.) American League, pledging fealty to the Government and favoring priority to war legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Central Federated Union of Greater New York and Vicinity and of the Board of Directors of the Society of American Dramatists and Composers, urging the repeal of the zone system as applied to second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON: Patriotic resolutions adopted by the Grand Commandery of the Knights Templar of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 7448, granting pension to Riley R. Zerbe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of the bill for the relief of Luther Detwiler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8044, granting pension to Mrs. Mary E. Roland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Lawrenceville, Ill., urging repeal of increased rate of postage on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.



By Mr. FREAR: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Northwestern Wisconsin Buttermakers' Association, protesting against the zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Northwest Wisconsin Buttermakers' Association, protesting against lowering tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of Trenton Chamber of Commerce, of Trenton, N. J.; the Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co., of Mansfield, Ohio; National Implement & Vehicle Association, of Chicago, Ill.; the Lombard Woman's Club, of Lombard, Ill.; L. M. Mason, of Streator, Ill.; Channing Pollock, of New York City; the faculty of Iowa Wesleyan College, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa; the faculty of Lake Erie College, of Painesville, Ohio; the Wednesday Morning Club, of Cranford, N. J.; the Illinois State Court of the Guardians of Liberty, and Miss Lydia Strawn, of Ottawa, Ill., asking for the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of the Illinois Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod, representing a membership of about 65,000 members, for the prohibition of the liquor traffic as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 211, Moline, Ill., United Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters of the United States, that Thomas Mooney and his associates be set free by May 1, 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Minch & Eisenberry Co., Baltimore, Md., opposing the passage of Senate bill 3076 and House bill 9863, relating to use of prison labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Smith, Dixon Co., urging the repeal of that part of the war-revenue act dealing with second-class postage rates; also petitions of J. F. Durbin & Co. and the Kennedy Foundry Co., favoring partial payment of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baltimore Typographical Union, No. 12, favoring passage of House bill 8702, for increase in pay of certain employees in Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Baltimore Belting Co., opposing an amendment to the food-control act to include hides and leather; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. L. Perkins, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of House bill 5712, pertaining to the circulation of certain fraternal matter in the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the board of directors of the Women's City Club, of New York, and a telegram from Annie G. Lyle, M. D., San Francisco, Cal., urging legislation to secure military rank for American Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letter from the students and faculty of the Siskiyou Union High School, protesting against the zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of citizens of Corsica and vicinity, and of Joseph Somerville and other citizens of East Brady and vicinity, State of Pennsylvania, protesting against zone rate of postage on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Society of Illustrators of America, asking repeal of zone postage rates for second-class matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 1, 1918.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 30, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Dillingham	Gronna	Jones, Wash.
Beckham	Fall	Guion	Kellogg
Brandegee	Fernald	Hale	Kirby
Calder	Fletcher	Harding	Knox
Culberson	France	Hardwick	Lenroot
Cummins	Frelinghuysen	Henderson	Lodge
Curtis	Gallinger	Johnson, Cal.	McCumber

McKellar  
McLean  
McNary  
Martin  
Myers  
Nelson  
New  
Nugent

Pittman  
Poindexter  
Pomerene  
Ransdell  
Saulsbury  
Shafroth  
Sheppard  
Sherman

Smith, Md.  
Smoot  
Sterling  
Sutherland  
Swanson  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Tillman

Townsend  
Trammell  
Underwood  
Vardaman  
Wadsworth  
Walsh  
Williams

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to state that my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], is detained by illness.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON], who is engaged in the liberty-loan campaign.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

### WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, transmitting a resolution favoring legislation to make available at the earliest possible date the water powers of the country, together with a tabulation of votes cast by commercial and trade organizations regarding the principles of water-power legislation, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3803) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States in connection with or incidental to the prosecution of the war.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. KAHN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. CYRUS A. SULLOWAY, late a Representative from the State of New Hampshire.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the Publishers' Association of New York City, N. Y., praying for the postponement of the operation of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the American Defense Society of the State of New York, praying for legislation to punish persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities, or who interfere with the prosecution of the war, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of the Progressive Women's League of Hartford, Conn., and of the Equal Franchise League of New Milford, Conn., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Trades Council of New Haven, Conn., praying for the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry rural mail carriers of Bridgeport, Stamford, New Britain, Watertown, Norwich, Windsor, and Somers, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for an increase in the salaries of rural mail carriers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, in the State of Minnesota, praying for an increase in the salaries of rural mail carriers, which were ordered to lie on the table.